

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

## Notes of Recent Exposition

THE name of Oscar CULLMANN is as well-known in English-speaking countries as it is in France and Germany in whose native languages he normally writes. Many of his books and some of his articles are already available in English translations. His latest considerable book, published in German in 1957, is now, with commendable speed, issued in English<sup>1</sup> in an admirable translation by Professors C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall, under the title *The Christology of the New Testament*. A detailed review of the book as a whole in its German edition was written by Dr. Vincent Taylor for our issue of February 1959, and readers who wish for full account of its contents are asked to refer to his earlier article. It may, however, serve to whet the appetite of potential readers of the English translation to recall one or two of the matters which Professor CULLMANN deals with in the introduction.

His first point is to emphasize that it was Christology which was the first intellectual concern of the Early Church. God the Father and the Holy Spirit were not the focus of interest. 'The oldest confessions are expressed exclusively in Christological terms.' Moreover, somewhat surprisingly, they connect Christ not so much with salvation as with creation: 'Through him are all things'. And where God is mentioned it is not as creator but as 'Father of Jesus Christ'. The Early Church also followed the lead of the New Testament in this respect. 'We can therefore say that early Christian theology is in reality almost exclusively Christology.' Moreover this particular concern long continued in the Church. 'In so far as it concentrated whole theological interest for several centuries on Christological discussion, the early Catholic Church remained close enough to the early Church.'

Professor CULLMANN then asks: What is the Christological problem in the New Testament? The later Christological controversies refer almost exclusively to the *person* or *nature* of Christ', but the New Testament hardly ever speaks of the person of Christ without at the same time speaking of His 'work'. 'When it is asked in the New

<sup>1</sup> S.C.M.; 42s. net.

Testament, "Who is Christ?" the question never means exclusively or even primarily, "What is his nature?" but first of all, "What is his function?"' 'In order to answer the question "Who is Jesus?", the first Christians had at their disposal certain concepts which were already present in Judaism, especially in Jewish eschatology. Therefore the Christological question was presented in the earliest period in the following way: To what extent did Jesus fulfil what these concepts implied? To what extent did his actual work go beyond what they implied?'

This question, 'Who is Jesus?', not only confronted the Early Church after the death and resurrection of Jesus, but emerged as a problem even during the lifetime of Jesus. Various answers were suggested: John the Baptist, Elijah, One of the Prophets. It was Peter who first put plainly into words the answer which finally superseded the others: 'Thou art the Christ'. And later many other names were given to Him. Each of these answers uses a familiar title, each describing at the same time a function and a work to be accomplished. 'All the answers have this in common that they do not simply place Jesus in a general human category, but attempt rather to explain his uniqueness.' 'The reason for his being described in so many ways is that no one of these titles by itself can comprehend all the aspects of his person and work. Each of them shows only one particular aspect of the whole wealth of convictions of faith about him which we find in the New Testament. Only when we investigate all the different titles which the first Christians conferred upon him shall we most nearly approach what we can call "the Christology of the New Testament".'

So we reach the section where Professor CULLMANN outlines the method of exposition which he is to follow. It is to study with detailed care these various titles applied to Jesus in the New Testament. The most important of them are listed as: Prophet, High Priest, Mediator, Servant of God, Lamb of God, Messiah, Son of David, Son of Man, Holy One of God, Lord, Saviour, King, Logos,

Son of God, God. 'No one single title', we are reminded, 'is sufficient to comprehend the infinite fullness disclosed in Christ.' It is in the totality of them, each one making its own significant contribution, that we shall find our nearest approach to the full truth of the matter.

In a parenthesis, printed in smaller type, Professor CULLMANN strongly affirms his belief that there is no need for modern scholars to capitulate to the school of extreme scepticism regarding our ability to recover with confidence the historical elements in the life and words of Jesus. Form Criticism has certainly compelled scholars to raise this question of the historicity of the Gospel material. The Gospels are indeed 'confessions of faith', and 'the early Church's faith in Christ is the real creator of the Gospel tradition'. But this fact does not of itself rule out its historical reliability. 'On the contrary this knowledge should encourage us to use the Church's faith in Christ as a means of discovering historical reality.' CULLMANN declares that he will, in the course of his book, 'attempt to distinguish between the places where the Gospel writers obviously express their own view, and the places where they report the word of Jesus himself. If there should be within a Gospel a certain discrepancy between the Christological titles which the writer uses and those which Jesus applies to himself, we shall have found an objective criterion for this distinction.'

He even defiantly asserts that 'we simply cannot neglect to take Jesus' own self-consciousness into consideration'; and, carrying the battle into the enemy's camp, takes Bultmann to task for his belief that he shares the early Christians' faith in Jesus as the Christ, while denying that Jesus ever thought of Himself in that way. 'In reality', claims CULLMANN, 'one essential characteristic of the early Church's faith in Christ was its conviction that Jesus believed himself to be the divine Son of Man, the Servant of God. . . . The early Church believed in Christ's Messiahship only because it believed that Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah. In this respect,' he adds, 'Bultmann's faith in Christ is fundamentally different from that of the early Church.'

Any book by Professor CULLMANN is assured of an enthusiastic welcome, and this one certainly will be no exception. Further special interest, however, attaches to this book, because it is only a year ago that Dr. Vincent Taylor's book on this subject (concluding a trilogy on the same theme) was published. Readers cannot fail to find interest in comparing them, noting the striking similarities (and some differences) both in method of approach and in some of the conclusions reached quite in-

dependently by two of our most eminent New Testament scholars.

The Apostle Paul in his own day was both a most significant and also a most controversial figure in the Church, and so he has remained through the Church's history. Still scholars debate his place in the Early Church and the nature of his relationships with the other apostles. A book on this subject has been written by Dr. Johannes MUNCK, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Aarhus, Denmark under the title *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*, and this has been translated into English by Frank Clarke with the title, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*.<sup>1</sup>

Professor MUNCK believes that a wrong approach has distorted recent studies of this theme, and he seeks to expose the false assumptions on which it is based. They spring from three main sources. The first of these is the tendency to use Acts as the primary source of information in preference to the much more reliable material contained in Paul's letters; the second is an unwarrantable desire to reduce Paul and his experiences to something psychologically explicable to the modern mind; and the third is the persisting influence of the Tübingen school of interpretation. Some of the more extreme theories of this school of thought have been widely abandoned, but others, such as the claim that there was acute tension between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles, continue to be accepted somewhat uncritically.

The author examines first Paul's conversion and call. He criticises severely attempts to represent these in psychological terms as the outcome of prolonged moral struggle, since there is no evidence in the New Testament for this 'rationalisation' of his experience. It has been imposed on it by modern thought. In the New Testament this event in Paul's life is nothing less than a miracle, the direct and unexplained intervention of God in the life of one marked out by God to carry out a unique assignment in His destined purposes for mankind. Paul must not be 'secularized'. He must be recognized as God's 'apocalyptic messenger', fulfilling an eschatological rôle.

His apostleship has significance far greater than that of the Church's greatest missionary. Part of his message is to proclaim the nearness of the Second Coming of Christ, but he knows that before this can take place the gospel must first be preached to all nations. But it is Paul himself who has been appointed apostle to the Gentiles.

<sup>1</sup> S.C.M.; 42s. net.

It is he who is marked out by God to fulfil this first stage which must be completed before Christ can come again. When, therefore, he speaks in Thessalonians of 'that which restrains' or 'one who restrains' the forces of Anti-Christ, which are destined to break loose as an immediate prelude to the Second Coming, Paul is speaking of himself. He must carry the gospel to all nations before Anti-Christ can assert himself, and it is the fact that this task is not yet finished which holds Anti-Christ in check. In this unusual interpretation, Professor MUNCK closely follows the exposition of Professor Cullmann.

It is this sense of destiny which lies behind Paul's statement in Ro 15<sup>19</sup>, that he has fully reached the gospel from Jerusalem to Illyricum. Modern exponents suggest that this means that he has been able to establish Christian communities in all the strategic points in these areas, centres from which the message of the gospel can now be carried out by those he leaves behind. His own task is not to evangelize every individual but to establish centres of evangelism. Now, therefore, he himself can feel free to look further westwards towards the unevangelized areas beyond Rome, even as far as Spain. But this is a 'rationalization'. The correct interpretation is found in the sense of corporate life, characteristic of the ancient world. A group within a nation may be taken to represent the whole nation, and when Paul has evangelized one representative group he can claim to have evangelized the whole nation. He has preached the gospel to all nations east of Rome because some members of those nations have heard it. His eschatological task has, therefore, been fulfilled in the eastern half of the world.

Although Professor MUNCK will not allow that there was any tension between Peter and Paul, he recognizes that they each followed a basically different strategy. Peter had been recognized in the Church as the apostle to the circumcised, just as Paul was apostle to the uncircumcised. Peter and the Jewish Christians, therefore, continued to follow the method which Jesus Himself had used. He had offered his message primarily to Jews, in the hope that when they had been won, they would become the means of winning the Gentile world. It was not that the Gentiles were left out but only that it was 'Jews first'; then the 'Gentiles'. 'Let the children first be fed', as Jesus said to the Syro-Phoenician woman. Paul, however, had been commissioned to go at once particularly to the Gentiles, and there he saw the gospel being accepted, and the Church growing with incredible speed. At the same time the gospel was largely rejected by the Jews, and the Church did not gain adherents among them.

This proved that Peter's policy was not correct, and presented a painful problem. God's chosen people, to whom God's promises had first been made, had not accepted the gospel; but the Gentiles *were* accepting it in increasing numbers. It is this problem which Paul faces in Ro 9-11, where he declares that God's purpose, now that Israel is rejecting the gospel, is that the Gentiles shall first be won, and then the people of Israel will be goaded by rivalry to accept the gospel also, and so all will come into the Kingdom. This difference in tactics is the only difference between Peter and Paul. They do not differ at all on the conditions on which Gentiles are to be accepted into the Church.

Professor MUNCK argues strongly that Paul's difficulties with 'Judaizers' were not at all connected with Peter or James or the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem. None of these ever thought of insisting that Gentiles should be circumcised before being accepted into the Church. The Judaizers who harassed Paul's work were in fact *Gentile* Christians, converts to Christianity who came to feel that their faith in Christ was not enough; to be fully within God's promises they needed to be within the Jewish faith also. If we ask what could make Gentile Christians reach such conclusions, Professor MUNCK answers that it was partly because Paul himself spoke in such warm and affectionate terms of his own Jewish past, and also because the only Scriptures which these first Christians had were the Jewish Scriptures. While Paul was present, he interpreted them in the light of Christ; but when he had gone, these Scriptures were seen to insist on circumcision and observance of the Law.

In order to maintain these positions, Professor MUNCK continually insists that Paul's letters are our primary authority; Acts is a later and far less reliable document, and its evidence is discarded if it does not wholly support what Paul has written, or what Professor MUNCK understands to be the meaning of Paul's words. To establish his points of view, he gives several chapters to detailed expositions of those chapters in Galatians, Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians which have conventionally been interpreted as implying interference from Jerusalem in Paul's missionary work.

This is a long and carefully argued book, which challenges accepted theories and proposes new solutions to old problems. If it does not convince readers of the undoubted validity of the new positions it seeks to establish, it will at least compel them to re-examine the grounds on which more conventional opinions have been, perhaps too easily, accepted.

## Recent Trends in Johannine Studies

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL., D.D., MASTER OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, ABERDEEN

WAS there ever a book which inspired such a flood of writing about it as the Gospel according to St. John? Nor does the flood show any signs of abating. The last decade has produced its own quota of notable books on the Gospel; and whatever the 'sixties' may hold for the world in general, we may safely prophesy that they will add to Johannine bibliography.

But do all these books really increase our understanding of this Gospel whose words, as Luther said, are so simple yet so inexpressible? Or are our savants just ringing the changes on the old issues and darkening counsel with learned words?

Whatever the cynical may say, it seems to us that in recent years the Johannine debate has taken some very interesting turns. Our scholars now expend far less time and ink than the men of the last generation in re-shuffling the leaves of the Gospel to secure an allegedly better order or in trying to separate off a hypothetical *Grundschrift* from the work of various redactors. Finding no certainty on the question of authorship, they have concentrated on the book itself, its background and its theology, with results that seem highly promising for the future.

Paradoxically enough, it has sometimes been *Altestamentlers* who have given the debate its most stimulating turns. First, it was C. F. Burney, then C. C. Torrey, and finally W. F. Albright. Of all the excellent essays in the *Festschrift* for C. H. Dodd none has excited more comment than Albright's essay on the Fourth Gospel.<sup>1</sup> In what follows we propose to develop some of his suggestions and to combine them with the fruits of other recent researchers.

The trends of our title concern the language of the Gospel, its topography, its background, and its historical traditions. Let us see where we stand on these matters in 1960.

### I

First, we can be tolerably sure (thanks to Schlatter, Burney, Torrey, Driver, and Black) that St. John's Greek reveals an unmistakable Aramaic accent.

Every reader of the Gospel remembers how St. John transliterates Aramaic words like Cephas and Gabbatha and adds a Greek translation. This in

itself implies some knowledge of Aramaic. But the Aramaic quality of John's Greek is not a matter of single words only but of syntax, idiom, and general style.

Consider, for example, his fondness for parataxis, *i.e.*, the setting side by side of complete sentences with main verbs instead of using subordinate clauses. Your good Greek writer prefers to use one main verb and surround it with subordinate clauses. But parataxis is a prime feature of Hebrew and Aramaic style, and it is significant how very fond St. John is of it. 'He spat . . . and made . . . and put . . . and said' (Jn 9<sup>6f.</sup>). This is the kind of thing we find in many of his sentences.

Asyndeton, or the lack of connectives, is another Aramaic trait in his style. Anybody who has done Greek composition knows how important it is to connect up one sentence with another by means of suitable link-words. Where they are lacking, as they so often are in John, we may suspect Aramaic influence.

Other probable Aramaisms are to be found in his odd uses of *iva* and *ort* possibly concealing an Aramaic *dē*; in his employment of the redundant pronoun after a relative (*e.g.*, Jn 1<sup>27</sup>); and in the many examples of *casus pendens*.

But the search for Aramaic influence becomes really fascinating when we not only find many traces of the various kinds of parallelism (synonymous, antithetic, etc.) so characteristic of Hebrew poetry and of Jesus' teaching in the Synoptics, like—

'He who comes to me shall never hunger,  
And he who believes in me shall never thirst'  
or (Jn 6<sup>35</sup>)

'The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy:  
I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly' (Jn 10<sup>10</sup>)

but also evidence (as Dr. Matthew Black believes<sup>2</sup>) of Aramaic poetry revealing both strophic arrangement and assonance:

'He that hath the bride (*kall'atha*) is the bridegroom;  
He that standeth and heareth him is the friend of  
the bridegroom  
And rejoiceth greatly because of the voice (*qala*)  
of the bridegroom.  
He must increase,  
But I must decrease (*q'lal*)  
This my joy therefore is fulfilled (*k'lal*). (Jn 3<sup>29f.</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, 153–171.

<sup>2</sup> *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 109.

Let these examples suffice. Significantly, most of the Aramaisms occur in the sayings of Jesus rather than in the narrative. What conclusion may we therefore draw? Not that St. John translated some Aramaic document word for word (as Torrey said), but certainly that St. John was accustomed to think and speak in Aramaic as well as in Greek and probably that in the case of Jesus' sayings he used some kind of *logia* source—a Johannine Q!

## II

Let us pass now to his topography. If this turns out to be as unreliable as has sometimes been asserted, the link we have apparently begun to forge with Palestine will be gravely weakened. The question then is: How does St. John's topography look in the light of the latest archaeological researches? Does it consist, for example, with the theory that either he himself, or one of his informants, knew Palestine well? The answer is that it most certainly does.

There are in the Gospel some ten place-names not mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels. Three of these raise no difficulty at all: 'Cana of Galilee', the Pool of Siloam, and the wadi Kidron. Three others give a little more trouble: 'Bethany beyond Jordan', Solomon's Porch, and Ephraim. If we cannot locate 'Bethany beyond Jordan' precisely, this is not surprising; in the nature of the case a place used for baptizing would be hard to locate later. But that the scene of John's baptizing was in fact beyond Jordan seems to have been established by T. W. Manson.<sup>1</sup>

Nor need we have any serious doubts concerning the precise location of Solomon's Porch. The information which Josephus supplies makes it fairly certain that it formed part of the eastern side of the Court of the Gentiles. Cf. Ac 3<sup>11</sup> and 5<sup>12</sup>.

As for Ephraim, there seems to be a general agreement nowadays that it is to be identified with the modern Et-Taiyibeh.

But what of the four remaining place-names: Enon near Salim, Bethesda, Sychar, and Gabbatha?

According to Jn 3<sup>23f.</sup>, Jesus and His disciples came into Judea and baptized, for 'John also was baptizing at Ænon near Salim, because there were many waters there'. The location of Ænon may now be regarded as reasonably certain. East of Gerizim and south east from Nablus and Shechem lies the town of Salim of which traces survive in Israelite, Hellenistic, and Samaritan literature. And near to Salim lies *Ainun* with a name undoubtedly derived from the Aramaic *Ainon* meaning 'little fountain'. Since these two places lie

near the head-waters of Wadi Far'ah, with numerous springs in the neighbourhood, St. John might well declare that 'there were many waters there'.

The next place with a question mark over it till recently was the Pool of Bethesda (Jn 5<sup>2</sup>). The pool had never been located and, to make matters worse, the MSS here give a choice of names: Bethzatha, Belzetha, and Bethesda, besides Bethesda. But now a very strong case for the originality of the reading Bethesda, as well as for the identification of the Pool, has been made out by Jeremias.<sup>2</sup> He tells us how in 1931-32 he watched some excavations beneath a pile of rubbish, a hundred yards north of the Temple, which laid bare, beyond all reasonable doubt, the lost pool of Bethesda, covering an area of some five thousand yards. Quite recently, the Copper Scroll from Qumran has provided confirmation of this.

An old puzzle for scholars was the precise locality of Sychar, with Jacob's well near by (Jn 4<sup>4f.</sup>). Most of them, for lack of a better alternative, plumped for the modern *Askar* (in Arabic 'military camp'). But *Askar* was not free from objections (as, for instance, Why should the Samaritan woman have come half a mile from *Askar* for water when she might have got it at the *Ain* in her own village?).

E. Sellin's excavations in the area now seem to have provided the true solution. Shechem (Sellin has shown) was not on the site of modern Nablus but at Balatah less than a third as far as Askar from Jacob's well. Balatah was evidently occupied till A.D. 67 when Vespasian destroyed it with the Temple at Gerizim. The conclusion is that the 'Sychar' of most MSS is a mistake. Here we should follow the Old Syriac Gospels and read 'Sychem', i.e., Shechem.

Where did Pilate judge Jesus? According to Jn 19<sup>13</sup>, he took his seat at a place called the Pavement (*Lithostroton*) and in Aramaic, Gabbatha. This Pavement was in the Praetorium. But where was it? For decades many have located it at Herod's Palace near the Jaffa Gate. But in the thirties of this century Father L. H. Vincent's researches seem to have settled the matter in favour of the Antonia Tower, at the north-west corner of the Temple area.<sup>3</sup> There investigation disclosed a pavement covering two thousand five hundred square metres and standing on a rocky elevation to which the name *Gabbetha*, 'ridge', was fitly applied.

Thus archaeological discovery has, at point after point, confirmed St. John's topographical

<sup>2</sup> *Die Wiederentdeckung von Bethesda* [1949].

<sup>3</sup> 'L'Antonia et le Prétoire,' in *Revue Biblique*, xlii [1933], 83-113.

<sup>1</sup> *The Servant Messiah*, 40.

accuracy. Nor is this all. Most of the place-names which occur only in the Fourth Gospel belong to southern Palestine; while Galilean place-names common in the Synoptics, like Nain, Chorazin, Caesarea Philippi and Decapolis, are not found. It looks as if the Fourth Evangelist's traditions about Jesus were specially associated with southern Palestine.

### III

We now turn to consider the new light shed by the Dead Sea Scrolls on the Fourth Gospel.

After the alarms and excursions which followed the initial discovery of the Scrolls, we are beginning to appraise their value more realistically; and such experts as Millar Burrows and H. H. Rowley have recently set it on record that, after long study of the Qumran documents, they do not find their understanding of the New Testament substantially affected by them. If there is a possible exception to this, it concerns the conceptual background of the Fourth Gospel. To put the matter in one sentence, the Scrolls have established its essential Jewishness. Down at Khirbet Qumran, on the north-western shore of the Dead Sea and only a few hours' journey from the Judean scenes of the Lord's ministry, lived Jews who thought and spoke in the idioms and antitheses we have been in the habit of calling 'Johannine'.

Anyone who cares to peruse the text of the *Manual of Discipline* can prove this for himself. He will not have gone far before he lights on the very unGreek phrase 'to do the truth' (cf. Jn 3<sup>21</sup>, 1 Jn 1<sup>6</sup>) or a reference to 'the sons of light' (Jn 12<sup>36</sup>). A little later, finding an allusion to him who 'looks at the light of life', he will recall Christ's promise of the same 'light of life' to the man who follows him (Jn 8<sup>12</sup>). Further on the *Manual's* words about creation—

'By his knowledge everything has been brought into being,  
And everything that is, he established by his purpose,  
And apart from him, nothing is done'

will ring a Johannine bell in his memory—

'All things were made through him,  
And without him was not any thing made that was made'.

In a passage which describes the two spirits—'the spirit of truth' (cf. Jn 14<sup>17</sup>, etc.) and 'the spirit of error' (cf. 1 Jn 4<sup>6</sup>)—which dominates men's lives, he will learn that 'the sons of error walk in the ways of darkness' and recall Christ's warning against 'walking in darkness' (Jn 12<sup>35</sup>).

Finally, this Qumran contrast between the wise man and the foolish—

'According to each man's inheritance in truth he does right, and so he hates error; but according to his possession in the lot of error he does wickedly in it, and so he abhors the truth'

will send his mind back to the third chapter of the Fourth Gospel—

'For every one who does evil hates the light, and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who does what is true comes to the light that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God' (Jn 3<sup>20f</sup>).

These comparisons, which could easily be multiplied, strongly suggest that, if we are seeking parallels to the thought-world of St. John, we have no need to go ransacking the literature of the Gnostic sects who flourished in the Hellenistic world of the second century. The closest parallels to the antitheses of the Fourth Gospel—light and darkness, truth and error, spirit and flesh—are to be found in the Qumran documents.

This brings us to the cardinal point, on which scholars like K. G. Kuhn, W. F. Albright, Millar Burrows, W. H. Brownlee, Bo Reicke, and J. Jeremias speak with one voice: the dualism which pervades the Johannine writings is of precisely the same kind as we discover in the Dead Sea Scrolls: not physical or substantial (as in the Greek Gnostics) but monotheistic, ethical, and eschatological.

To say that the dualism is monotheistic is another way of saying that it is a modified, not a thorough-going, dualism. The opposition between light and darkness consists not of two eternal and equipollent powers but of two created powers both of which are ultimately subservient to God.

Next, the dualism is ethical. Just as 'light is for him [St. John] primarily the symbol of sheer goodness, darkness of moral evil',<sup>1</sup> so it is for the men of Qumran.

Lastly, it is eschatological. Both the men of the Scrolls and St. John see history as the scene of a great battlefield in which light struggles with darkness for the mastery. But if the Qumran sectaries see the *Eschaton* lying in the near future, St. John declares that the End has already begun.

It may be useful to compare and contrast the theologies of the Scrolls and St. John on four points of detail.<sup>2</sup>

First. Both St. John and the sectaries believe (see the words about creation already quoted) in the creation of all by God.

<sup>1</sup> C. H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*, 18.

<sup>2</sup> Here I am indebted to Raymond E. Brown's essay in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 183–207.

Second. Both see men as ranged in the two opposing 'camps' of light and darkness, each with personal leader. But, whereas for the sectaries the leader of the sons of light is an angel, *i.e.*, a created being, for St. John he is the uncreated Word himself.

Third. Both believe 'there is a war on'. But, whereas for the men of Qumran it is a dingdong struggle not to be decided till the last great battle—a kind of Armageddon—between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, for St. John, the victory is already, in large measure, won—the darkness is passing away and the true light is already shining' (1 Jn 2<sup>8</sup>).

Fourth. Both St. John and the Scrolls agree that the answer to the question, 'What must I do to be saved?' is, 'You must become a son of light'. But, whereas the Qumran view is that this means obedience to the Law, *as interpreted in the Qumran Community*, for St. John it means the acceptance of Christ as 'the light of the world' (Jn 8<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>36,46</sup>).

In fine, the basic difference between the Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel is, as we might have expected, the Fact of Christ.

It has been worthwhile, even shortly, to dwell on the theological differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Scrolls; nevertheless, it is their conceptual resemblances, as they are focused in the doctrine of dualism, which matter most for our present purpose. The conclusion to be drawn is that, if we are searching for parallels to St. John's

words and ideas, we need not travel further than the caves of Qumran. 'The Scrolls show', says Millar Burrows,<sup>1</sup> 'that we do not need to look outside Palestinian Judaism for the soil in which the Johannine theology grew.' And J. Jeremias,<sup>2</sup> summing up similarly, makes the point too often forgotten, that the theologies of both the New Testament and of the Scrolls have a common root in the Old Testament. 'Thus the Fourth Gospel is not to be interpreted against the background of Gnostic presuppositions but against that of Palestinian, Old Testament theological thinking, and of a piety rooted and grounded in the Bible.'

What bearing have these strong resemblances of word and idea between the Scrolls and St. John on the question of the Gospel's date and authorship?

They do not, of course, prove the traditional theory of apostolic authorship. But, when taken along with the Evangelist's Aramaicised Greek and his accurate topography of southern Palestine, they make conservative answers much more plausible. On the matter of date we may say this now. Once we realize that the peculiar phraseology of the Gospel is Palestinian, and even pre-Christian, we cannot use it, as scholars once did, as an argument for dating the Gospel late.

To both these questions we shall return. Meanwhile, let us consider next the worth of the historical traditions about Jesus embedded in the Gospel. (*To be continued.*)

<sup>1</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 339f.

<sup>2</sup> *The Expository Times*, lxx. [December, 1958], 69.

## Literature

### A NEW COMMENTARY ON ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

A new commentary on St. Mark's Gospel has been added to 'The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary' which is being edited by Professor F. D. Moule, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. The commentary, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Cambridge University Press; 40s. net), is the work of the Rev. C. E. B. Cranfield, Lecturer in Theology in the Durham Colleges, University of Durham. One of the aims of the series is, in the words of the General Editor, to elucidate 'the theological and religious contents of the New Testament, and to see it in the setting of the life and worship of Christian communities'. In his able and competent work Mr. Cranfield gives considerable attention to the theology of the Gospel, as we should expect him to do from his

articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES and 'The Scottish Journal of Theology', but he is also deeply interested in its literary and historical problems to which he devotes the fullest consideration.

His brief Introduction discusses the authorship, date, and priority of Mark and affirms the views commonly held on these questions. In the treatment of the character of the Gospel four different kinds of narrative material are distinguished: Petrine stories, pronouncement-stories, narratives constructed by the Evangelist, and brief summary statements. Much of the sayings material is traced to a Roman collection. Mr. Cranfield maintains that Mark was an extremely honest and conscientious compiler and holds that a substantially reliable picture of the history of Jesus was present in his sources. The section on textual criticism is supplied in an able summary by J. N. Sanders, but it must be added

that in the body of the commentary textual questions are discussed by Mr. Cranfield with discernment, notably in 1<sup>1.41</sup> 7<sup>4</sup> and 8<sup>26</sup>. More debatable is his acceptance of the reading 'the carpenter, the Son of Mary' in 6<sup>3</sup>, which is held to be 'an important piece of evidence in support of the historicity of the Virgin Birth'. A valuable feature throughout is the explanation of words and literary constructions.

The tendency of the commentary is conservative, and is no worse for that, but frequently Mr. Cranfield appears to claim too much, especially as regards the Nature-miracles. Even the cursing of the fig tree is defended as an acted parable. Nevertheless, the problems are faced fearlessly, and in stating clearly his own opinions Mr. Cranfield does not fail to give detailed reasons for them. The true significance of the miracles, he maintains, is recognizable only by faith; 'they are', he says, 'as it were, chinks in the curtain of the Son of God's hiddenness'. This is certainly an attractive view, but in the minds of some readers the question will arise whether he has allowed sufficiently for even good tradition to suffer in the course of transmission and for the limitations to which the Son of God was subjected in His incarnate life. This criticism does not apply in general to his treatment of the sayings-tradition. Thus, while claiming that the Eschatological Discourse in 13<sup>5-37</sup> gives us substantially our Lord's teaching, he recognizes that we may not have His exact words. 'It is intrinsically likely', he says, 'that his words have suffered some modification in the course of transmission here as elsewhere in the gospels.' In discussing 8<sup>38</sup> he makes the interesting suggestion that there is no reason why Jesus should not have used personal pronouns when speaking of Himself in His earthly life, but the mysterious and ambiguous *Bar-nasha*, Son of Man, of Himself at His Parousia. Among other well-argued opinions he holds that the Last Supper was the Passover Meal, and he rightly rejects the view of the late R. H. Lightfoot that originally the Gospel ended at 16<sup>8</sup>.

Altogether, the commentary reflects much credit upon its author and will have to be taken into account in future discussions of St. Mark's Gospel. The bibliography is especially full and important and the format of the work leaves nothing to be desired. VINCENT TAYLOR

### THE SEMITES

Professor S. Moscati, the gifted and prolific Professor in the University of Rome, recently delivered some lectures in Cardiff University College, which have now been published under the title *The Semites in Ancient History* (University

of Wales Press; 15s. net). This is not a history of the Semites, but a study of their emergence into history in the various areas, down to the rise of Islam. The first lecture deals with the group of languages known as Semitic and its relation to certain African or Hamitic languages, and with the correct use of the term 'Semitic' in relation to human groups. The author argues that the Semites were nomad Beduin of Arabia, but that we should speak of the Semitic peoples, rather than people, of the surrounding areas, since here the migrating Semites infiltrated into various local stocks already settled there and became grafted on them. In the second lecture he discusses Mesopotamia, in the third Syria, and in the final lecture Arabia. The reason for this apparently illogical order is that the Semites first emerge into history in Mesopotamia, then in Syria, and only lastly in their original home. Ethiopia is left out of account since the Semitic migration to that country was not from the Arabian desert, but was the secondary migration of already settled people from South Arabia.

A great number of intricate and often much discussed problems are examined in these very learned and acute lectures, from which every reader will learn not a little, and common opinions are challenged again and again. The author is widely read and brings an active and independent mind to every problem. Sometimes he finds a *via media* between sharply opposed views. Thus, while he accepts substantially Albright's view that the domestication of the camel should be assigned to the twelfth century, he observes that this must have taken place progressively, and so the earlier traces of domestication that have been adduced by other authors are not fatal to the thesis. He notes that the Mari texts of the second millennium B.C. contain much evidence of the living conditions of the Beduin, but do not mention the camel.

The section that deals with the movement of the Israelites into Palestine is cautious and balanced. Professor Moscati recognizes a historical foundation for the Biblical accounts, but holds that they have been schematized. The penetration of the Israelites is held to have been spread over a long period and to have been in part peaceful, and while he recognizes the evidence for one phase of the penetration about 1200 B.C., he holds that it is an undue simplification of the question to ascribe it to that date *tout simple*.

H. H. ROWLEY

### WESTERN ASCETICISM

The latest addition (vol. xii.) to 'The Library of Christian Classics', *Western Asceticism*, edited by

Professor Owen Chadwick, does much to enhance the value of this series now well passed the halfway mark (S.C.M.; 35s. net). It contains three major documents representative of the beginnings of Christian monasticism as it most deeply affected the Western Church, namely 'The Sayings of the Fathers', 'The Conferences of John Cassian', and 'The Rule of St. Benedict'. The importance of St. Benedict's *Rule*, 'one of the classical documents of Christian history', need not be stressed. It was not an original production, but the extent of dependence on earlier writings is still debated. It is generally recognized that John Cassian, particularly through his *Conferences*, exercised more influence upon St. Benedict than any other single writer. Important as they are in this connexion, the *Conferences*, ostensibly based on Cassian's interviews with various ascetics of the Egyptian desert and containing the substance of Egyptian teaching as it influenced the West, have a much broader significance. They form one of the main channels by which the ideals of Eastern spirituality penetrated and moulded Latin Christianity. They were common reading in the monasteries down to the Reformation. Other channels of Eastern influence were provided by the various collections of the *Apophthegmata* of the desert fathers, amongst which the most important was the *Adorationes Patrum* or *Verba Seniorum*. Those who know Miss Helen Waddell's delightful little book, 'The Desert Fathers', containing selected sayings from this early Western collection will welcome the more extensive translation which this volume provides. Scholars will also welcome the Appendix embodying the editor's critical apparatus to the text.

JAMES K. CAMERON

### LUTHER'S THEOLOGY OF SOCIETY

There is perhaps no aspect of Luther's theology more misunderstood than his theology of society. On this the Schwaermer were wrong; so were the peasants; so were the secular leaders. The position has not improved after four centuries of involvement in social, political and cultural ideologies. Further, Calvin differed from Luther in this central theme. And since then the whole conception of society has undergone a revolution. Therefore it was with great interest the reviewer turned to this very learned theological essay on Luther's evangelical theology in relation to his conception of society—*An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society*, by F. Edward Cranz ('Harvard Theological Studies', xix. Oxford University Press; \$2.50).

The essay reads like a first-class doctoral dissertation, and the author wears his learning humbly and gracefully. The argument he pursues is

in the generally accepted developmental approach, though the reviewer takes the different view that Luther's theology was worked out at a very early stage in his career, and the alleged development is due less to development and more to the polemical sharpening of the issues. Cranz shows the early tensions between righteousness and Law, and how by about the time of the Heidelberg Disputation in 1518 Luther resolved them by holding that before God the believer is justified, but as far as society is concerned this antecedent justification is primary to his secondary justification in the world where it is partial and in process. Within this context Luther develops the necessity of civil law as distinct from theological law. In his fourth and last chapter Cranz develops Luther's theology of Church and of Society. On the basis of the two realms of existence he develops Luther's theology of the estates and callings; of God's spiritual government and of world government; and, thirdly, of the three hierarchies of the home, the world, and the spirit. Luther always saw that it is the absence of this theological basis that eventualizes into secularism and the consequent disaster for man in society where the world claims to be and to function as 'a church'.

The reviewer enjoyed the sound learning of the book, not least the brilliant and valuable footnotes, doubtless the influence of much reading in German theology! It is Cranz's clear-sighted hold of the relation of Gospel and Law in Luther's theology that empowers the author to get and to keep straight such a learned and difficult monograph. His section on the Church alone is a worthy contribution to ecumenical theology, and the whole work is wholesome and informed. The summary of his argument under the table of contents is helpful, for the book, though written in a clear determined style, demands very much from the reader, particularly the general reader.

The book is a fine contribution to Luther's views on society reminding Christians and non-Christians alike that apart from Luther's theological premises of Justification in Christ and the Gospel-Law tension, there is no conception of Church and State but rather the disastrous confusion of these two divine ordinances: either, a secularized State which takes the rôle of a church, or a pseudo-church which adopts the rôle of the State. The whole work is an apt contribution to a living issue in the world.

J. ATKINSON

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

*Seeing Things: A Second Handbook of Religious Education with Suggestions for Visual Aids and Activities*, by the Rev. A. J. Watts, M.A.,

Dip.Ed. (S.P.C.K. ; 25s. net). The first Handbook was, of course, 'No New Thing'. Like its predecessor, this book is beautifully produced and its thirty-one charts and diagrams themselves show the value of 'Seeing Things'.

The author describes his work as 'a scrapbook'. The pieces have, however, been chosen by one who has operated on all fronts of Christian Education and each piece is marked by his own experience and observation. There is too an underlying unity because throughout he seeks to display helpful methods of communicating the Christian Faith to young people of eleven or older. His own alternative title sums up his very practical aim exactly, 'To Start You Teaching—in This and That Direction!'

Mr. Watts writes as a 'definite Anglican', and some of what he writes, especially about the opportunities for Anglicans under the 1944 Education Act, is of real interest only to his own communion. But elsewhere his sensible suggestions for the use of the Church's books, the Church's furnishings, and the Church's Year (as in the chapter on 'The Hallowing of Time') can well be studied and adapted by non-Anglicans for their practical value is integrating young people into the life of the Church.

All the chapters have good ideas for teaching. Outstanding perhaps are the chapters on 'Seeing the Bible as a Library' and 'Seeing the Pattern that Explains the Bible' with the excellent diagrams in which their teaching is summed up. For those who feel with H. R. Weber that we in the West are living increasingly 'in a middle class ghetto ruled by word culture', the chapter on 'The Use of Signs and Symbols' opens up new possibilities above and beyond the conventional Bible picture, which has too often been the standard for visual aids.

There is just a suspicion that at times Mr. Watts' ingenuity could lead him to transgress his own good rules about the relation of method to content, as in his commendation of a religious version of 'Happy Families'. Some ideas may 'add to the fun' but do they leave a lasting and a right impression?

But this is a good, practical book even to disagree with and to be forced to think out other ways of doing the same thing half as well.

JOHN GRAY

#### UNDERSTANDING ISLAM

The 'Christian Presence Series' could hardly have a better beginning than is given to it by Dr. Kenneth Cragg, Editor of 'The Muslim World' in *Sandals at the Mosque* (S.C.M. ; 2s. 6d. net). After an Introduction to the Series as a whole by

Dr. Warren, in which he quotes from Dr. Cragg what might be described as the keynote of the book—'if we would in the end bespeak an adequate Muslim awareness of Christ we must essay an adequate Christian awareness of Islam . . . '—the author himself explains the symbolism of his title. At the door of every mosque it is the unbroken custom to leave the ordinary footwear behind, this signifying that in purposeful worship there must be a detachment from day-to-day occupations; but on emergence from the sacred place this footwear must be resumed, the worshipper thus indicating that he is committed to carry the spirit of his worship into the world of every day. Throughout this book—which it is both a pleasure and a profit to read—Dr. Cragg appeals to Christians desirous of understanding Islam that they should cultivate the grace of humility and a faith in the 'togetherness of religions', without, however, succumbing to weak-minded compromise in order to get rid of difficulties by ignoring them and asserting the likeness of things that are really unlike. They should sit where Muslims sit, conceiving it possible that God may have revealed Himself in other religions as well as in Christianity, and, remaining always loyal but not dogmatic followers of Christ, praying that their souls may be filled with wonder at the wideness of the love of God and hope for the coming of the day of Jesus Christ. Dr. Cragg is very severe in his criticism of those who would rely on the proclamation of a fixed and stereotyped gospel and who hope that to 'preach impatiently an unexplained gospel' will further 'inter-religious relationship'. He thinks that there are many similarities between the teaching of the Quran and the New Testament, but that certain differences must never be overlooked. He supplies an acute analysis of the relation between religion and the State in the Muslim world, but he thinks that this has been over-stressed and that the result is conservatism and greater emphasis upon keeping the unchanging law of God than upon the discovery of the love of God and His action upon the world of the present day as disclosed in the Incarnate and Risen Christ. Dr. Cragg reaches the climax of his teaching in the suggestion that in the understanding and obeying of the threefold message of the temptation of Christ in the wilderness is to be found the solution of the religious needs of to-day both for Muslims and Christians.

W. S. URQUHART

#### KIERKEGAARD

It would be difficult to find two books about S. Kierkegaard which differ more in what they offer and in the demands they make on the reader than these two—*Glimpses and Impressions* off

*Kierkegaard*, selected and translated by the late Dr. T. H. Croxall (Nisbet; 15s. net) and Professor Hermann Diem, *Kierkegaard's Dialectic of Existence*, translated by H. Knight (Oliver and Boyd; 21s. net). The former sheds light on him by recording impressions he made upon some of his most intimate acquaintances and relatives. It contains extracts from their diaries and correspondence. All Kierkegaard lovers will be grateful for the recollections of his niece, Henriette Lund, and for the availability of new material on Kierkegaard's clerical brother Peter, and their relationships. The most interesting material in the volume, however, is connected with the letters which Kierkegaard left to be read only after his decease and with the reaction of Regina Schlegel to their contents.

The other volume contains a thorough and sustained examination of Kierkegaard's dialectic of existence, obviously a very much tougher proposition. Its importance is indicated by the fact that it was awarded the prize for an essay on this subject, by the Søren Kierkegaard Society of Copenhagen. The author has made a lifetime study of Kierkegaard and here are offered his major conclusions.

Kierkegaard's concepts are dynamic throughout. Life cannot be imprisoned in Aristotelian logic or in any method of abstraction. Existence is not, but is always becoming. True Christianity is motion, the coming of eternity into time, of the infinite into the finite. It, therefore, calls for categories all its own and these can only be appropriated by faith. Faith is not assent to historical facts or the acceptance of what is objectively true. Truth is subjectivity, the only kind of truth that ultimately matters for the existentialist. '*Objective incertitude, clung to and appropriated with passionate inwardness, is truth, the highest truth that there can be, for one who exists.*'

In the interests of truth in this sense Kierkegaard was bound to attack all the objective pillars by means of which men sought to buttress their faith—Bible, Creed, Church, Establishment, Authority—these are all hindrances to faith. The established Church is so busy persuading everybody that they are Christians already that it stands in the way of their ever appreciating what Christianity is about. 'To be engaged in the process of becoming is more spiritual than to exist officially.' The common criticism that Kierkegaard had a very inadequate conception of the Church is amply illustrated here. The only truth is truth for the individual. Devotion to the Church is idolatry, a substitute for true discipleship.

Such is the theme of this book. It is well known, of course, to every student of Kierkegaard but it is nowhere set out so concisely as here.

Those who are drawn to him will welcome it and perhaps his critics will be glad to find this dialectic of existence so conveniently set out for criticism.

PERCY SCOTT

---

*The Battle for the Soul*, by the Rev. Owen Brandon, M.A. (Hodder and Stoughton; 4s. 6d. net), may be cordially commended as a study of aspects of religious conversion. The author has drawn upon his years of experience of a pastoral evangelistic ministry as well as on his studies in the psychology of religious experience. He does not pretend to answer all the questions; indeed, on several topics he calls for more study and research; but what he has to say about types of conversion, factors leading to conversion, and the lapsed convert is much to the point and should be taken account of by all concerned.

---

By permission of the Oxford University Press the Independent Press has published at 5s. net *Introduction to Calamy Revised*, being a revision of the Original Introduction by the Rev. A. G. Matthews, M.A. Calamy was more interested in his biographies than his statistics, and his authorities for his work on the clergy ejected in England in 1662 were chiefly unofficial documents privately compiled. Since his day other sources have become available and historical research has become something of a science. Inevitably, therefore, new point has been given to some old criticisms of Calamy. On the other hand, a few additions to his list fall to be made. Notice of all this is taken in this little book which it was worth while to publish separately.

---

The twenty-eighth volume of the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series consists of Tertullian's two treatises on penitence—*On Penitence* and *On Purity*. The translator and annotator is Professor William P. Le Saint, S.J., S.T.D. (Longmans; 30s. or 25s. on standing order).

Of the importance of these two treatises there is no doubt, for they are foundation documents for the doctrine and the practice of penance in the Early Church. And of the importance of this edition of them there is equally no doubt, for although these works have often been discussed, and although the problems they raise have often been written about and debated, this is the first complete commentary in any language on their text. It is also to be noted that *On Penitence* belongs to Tertullian's orthodox period, while *On Purity* belongs to his later Montanist period.

The great problem which these treatises raise is this: is this penitence which must follow post-baptismal sin an ecclesiastical process ending in

ecclesiastical absolution, or is it a private and personal matter between the sinner and God, in which the absolution is granted by God alone? And, further, if this process ends in ecclesiastical absolution, does it reconcile the sinner only to the Church, or does it reconcile him also to God?

Dr. Le Saint's conclusion is that this penitence involves *exomologesis* which is an ecclesiastical process and does end in ecclesiastical absolution; and that this process does directly reconcile the sinner to the Church, but indirectly and mediately to God Himself.

It may well be seen that there are great and controversial issues here.

In a short notice like this it is impossible to enter into the debate. It is enough to say that the translation is well and accurately done and that it rightly tends towards being literal rather than paraphrastic. Long ago Lactantius said of Tertullian that he is *parum facilis, minus comptus, multum obscurus*, and Jerome said of him that he is *creber in sententiis sed difficilis in loquendo*. Dr. Le Saint's commentary, with its massive knowledge of the relevant literature, does a difficult piece of work outstandingly well. This is an excellent and useful volume in a consistently notable series.

As editor and literary critic, as husband of Katherine Mansfield, and friend of D. H. Lawrence, Middleton Murry seems assured of a minor niche in the temple of fame. In and beyond these rôles, however, he was a seeker in quest of a full and satisfying way of life. He often wrote books and articles not to proclaim what he had found but to help himself to realize what he was finding. It is the great virtue of the official biography, *The Life of John Middleton Murry*, by Mr. F. A. Lea (Methuen; 30s. net), that it makes this quest the thread upon which the whole strange and fascinating story is hung. Inevitably such an experimental man as Murry went astray, making bad mistakes and suffering for them, but toward the end he reached peace—happy in his fourth marriage, cultivating the land, if not an orthodox Christian, at least a believer in a personal God and able to become a communicant member of the Church of England.

A volume of Murry's lay sermons—*Not as the Scribes*—has been issued by the S.C.M. at 18s. net. These sermons were addressed to a small farming community which he had founded. They are here arranged according to the Christian year, with three extra for special occasions, and they have been edited by his friend, Dr. A. R. Vidler, who writes an Introduction and explains that Murry was one of those who could not get away from 'the conviction that in the spiritual ex-

perience of Jesus and in the spiritual movement that stems from Him there lies the clue to what human history and human experience ought to be'. These sermons may be said to represent Murry's attempt to tell what in his own experience Jesus meant to him. Other seekers should profit from them, for one feels that this seeker had found more than he knew and that his relation to Jesus was more reverential than his humanist categories would allow.

In Mr. Lea's book we note misprints on pp. 206 and 302.

The opening section of *The Teachings of Pope Pius XII*, edited by Michael Chinigo with the co-operation of the Vatican authorities, has been published by Methuen at 3s. net under the title *Man*. There is much common sense and Christian wisdom about man, woman, marriage, and the family in this paper-covered booklet of some seventy pages. Only now and again will the discerning reader note the distinctive Romanist emphasis, and even when he disagrees at such points he will rejoice in the pastoral concern that pervades the whole work and gives point to its admonitions and exhortations.

Whether the Church of England should make use of part-time priests is a topic of contemporary debate. Starting from the agreed concepts of the priesthood of all believers and the Church as the whole people of God, some argue that some of the laity should become part-time priests, others that some ordained ministers should take part-time secular jobs, while others incline to the view that laymen should fulfil their priestly function as laymen. A comprehensive discussion of these questions is contained in *Part Time Priests?*, edited by Mr. Robin Denniston (Skeffington; 16s. net). The contributors to the eighteen chapters include laymen, clergy, bishops, and an archbishop, together with a Roman Catholic who writes of Supplementary Ministries in the Latin Church and a Presbyterian who describes the Eldership in the Church of Scotland. The discussion is not all theoretical, for some of the contributors can adduce practical experience, and the debate has relevance to other communions than the Anglican.

This is a fascinating book, written in a pleasant, easy, discursive style—*Symbolism in the Bible and the Church*, by the Rev. Gilbert Cope, an Anglican priest (S.C.M.; 30s. net). The nature of the subject means that a very wide field is covered, and the scope of the treatment is clearly indicated by the titles of the seven divisions—I. Biblical Types; II. Medieval Imagery; III. Psychological Types; IV. Archetypes of Creation; V. Archetypes of

Male and Female; VI. Archetypes of Suffering; VII. Symbolism and Worship.

At one point (p. 180) the author says 'Inconclusive though many such speculations must be'—and at times the reader is inclined to feel that some of the associations of ideas are indeed speculative. But the discussion is always fresh and lively.

We draw attention particularly to the final division—'Symbolism and Worship'. Although the author is dealing with the present situation in the Church of England, his treatment of church architecture in this section of the book should stimulate thought in the Reformed Churches as a whole. It is good to remember that in an ancient basilican church the altar-table was set well forward and was certainly not at that period 'a very peculiar kind of sideboard' (p. 248).

The central concern of the book may be summarized by this quotation—'Protestantism generally has underestimated the value of symbols to the psyche of most people, whereas the Catholic tradition very easily slips over into the treacherous realm of magic and fetichism. Somewhere a middle way must be found so that the ministry of the word and the ministry of the sacraments are indissolubly linked, and the idolatrous veneration of either book or bread is avoided' (p. 275).

*The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church*, by the Rev. Alfred R. Shands (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), a priest of the Episcopal Church in America, deals with the relationship between liturgical revival and parish mission, and takes into account many aspects of the life of the Church to-day.

But one's appreciation of the importance of the theme and of the writer's sincerity and enthusiasm is dulled by the prolixity of undisciplined English prose. Also there is a naïveté in approach which may be illustrated by this quotation—'Lent and Easter should be times for special family religious observances. If the children are young enough, the family might have its own Palm Sunday procession when they return from church with their blessed palms. The father might read aloud the Palm Sunday story and then lead a procession throughout the house, while the children wave their palms and sing "All Glory, Laud, and Honour"'. The procession could end at the mantelpiece where the palms are placed in view as a reminder of the beginning of Holy Week' (p. 113).

In referring to the 'House Church', a dangerously misleading piece of contemporary phraseology, the writer, dealing with domestic celebrations of the Holy Communion, says: 'The House Church may begin with discussion in homes

and may lead to Bible study and prayers, but once people's Christian life is centred on the weekly Eucharist, sooner or later some one is going to ask for the Holy Communion in the same setting as Bible study and prayer, in the house. And why should they not have it?' (p. 115). Why not! The answer is that this is liturgical anarchy. The author uncritically ignores the profound principle that only in exceptional circumstances should the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be celebrated apart from the public worship of the congregation.

*The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ*, by Professor N. B. Stonehouse, Th.D. (Tyndale Press; 11s. 6d. net), is a re-issue of a book first published in 1944. Let it be said at once that this book amply deserved republication. Dr. Stonehouse holds that Mark was not writing a biography of Jesus and that in fact Mark is a 'theological' Gospel, but he holds equally strongly—and rightly—that that is no reason whatever for arguing that Mark's facts are not historically accurate. Matthew's interest is 'clearly shown not to consist in publishing a complete itinerary of Jesus' travels, or one that is virtually complete, but rather in setting forth a witness to Jesus as the Messianic Son of David'.

Dr. Stonehouse writes with real insight on 'the Messianic secret'. He makes the important suggestion that Jesus' commands to keep silent 'are directed not to those who benefitted from Jesus' releasing acts, but to the demons within these persons'. It would have been a reversal of all that was fitting, if the witness to the Messiahship of Jesus had come from demons. In regard to the disciples and to their apparent obtuseness Dr. Stonehouse writes: 'In our judgment the disciples, according to Mark, never stand in total darkness nor do they ever emerge into cloudless light'.

Dr. Stonehouse has ample knowledge of the literature on the subject. He deals fairly and wisely with the critical problems involved, but is not obsessed by them. He writes with very real wisdom: 'Whatever other questions may be legitimately raised as to the antecedents of the Gospels, the first obligation of the scholar is to understand the testimony of the records. There cannot but be a disastrous degeneration in exegesis where there is not an awareness of the primacy of exegesis.' Many a scholar might well set that quotation on his desk so that he might never forget it.

It need hardly be said that the standpoint of this book is characteristically conservative; but it must also be said that it is conservative scholarship at its best and fairest.

# Significant Modern Writers

D. H. Lawrence

BY PROFESSOR W. B. J. MARTIN, D.D., PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, DALLAS, TEXAS

LET'S face it. For many people the name of D. H. Lawrence is synonymous with pornography and sex, with banned books and erotic paintings. He was a wild man who despised reason and civilization and called for a return to the primitive. Did he not say, 'My great religion is a belief in the blood, in the flesh as being wiser than the intellect? We can go wrong in our minds, but what the blood feels and believes and says is always true'. He was the sworn enemy of modern industrialism, he hated democracy, he attacked religion, he criticized the teaching of Jesus, he called for a return to the dark gods. . . .

Nevertheless there are many for whom he is the greatest imaginative writer of our generation, one who has shed more light on human nature, on love and marriage, on the real nature of religion, and the inner significance and importance of Christian doctrine, than any other writer of our time. And perhaps no modern author has had such a direct influence on the lives of his readers, many of whom owe to him their emancipation from fear and nastiness, from the crippling emotional results of moralistic and legalistic religion, and even their eventual release into a mature and creative Christian faith.

About his status as a literary artist there can be no doubt. He was a major figure in many different fields; the novel, the short story, the travel book, the essay, literary criticism, letters, and, last but not least, poetry. His letters, according to Richard Aldington, are 'by far the most interesting and vital of this century . . . filled with pictures . . . and brilliant sayings'. His short stories, says Dr. Leavis, 'constitute a body of creative work which put him among the great writers—not merely among the memorable but among the great'. His *Studies in Classic American Literature* show him to be a great interpreter of letters, although D. S. Savage maintains that they are 'brilliant essays in intuitive psychology' rather than 'literary criticism'. As to his novels, E. M. Forster says flatly that 'he is the greatest imaginative novelist of our generation'. As a poet he stands in a class apart, astonishingly direct and vivid. As one critic has put it, 'If you read the three major poets of our age at a moment when Lawrence has a firm hold upon you, Hopkins dwindles to a gadget-fiend, Mr. Eliot is an Anglo Young Catholic, and Yeats a booming bittorn on a golden bough miles away from life'.

How does one lay hold of a writer so various and

many-sided? For myself, I get a foothold on this huge continent of a man by following through his rôle as poet and prophet, for this is the double strain in all his work. He was truly prophetic in virtue of his insight into the nature of the human crisis and his passionate protest against the forces that thwarted the human spirit; he was a poet, even in his novels, by virtue of his astonishing endowment of consciousness and sensory perceptiveness. It was his aim to extend and enrich the ability of man to relate himself to the cosmos, to his fellow-men, and to 'a vital and magnificent God'.

## I

About the prophetic status of Lawrence, his estranged friend John Middleton Murry, wrote in 1957, 'From all the inevitable inward contradictions with which he struggled there emerges a vivid and unforgettable figure, isolated, pathetic, heroic, and prophetic. For Lawrence was alone in the depth of his prescience of the crisis of humanity which has developed since his death.' Lawrence located the nature of that crisis in the inability of modern man to be religious, deeply and inwardly religious. In one of his letters he writes, 'Personally I am a passionately religious man, and the novels must be written from the depths of my religious experience'. But as he looked out upon the world of his time, he saw only pseudo-religion, a religion that had degenerated into prudential morality or bloodless sentimentality. His own definition of religion was 'living wholeness in living unison', 'to be in living organic relations with the cosmos'. As he says in his Australian novel, *Kangaroo*, 'what is wrong with modern society is that there is no connexion between the burning, throbbing unconscious soul and the clear-as-daylight conscious mind', and all his work is an attempt to 're-establish the living, organic connexions of man' with Nature, with mankind, and with the family. 'The great range of responses that have fallen dead in us have to come to life again.' It is significant that the now notorious *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was first entitled *Tenderness* by Lawrence himself, and it is best regarded as a religious tract, not in praise of sex, but of love; not abstract love, for Lawrence regarded all abstraction as of the devil, but love that involved the whole personality and liberated men from purely external relationships and the increasing deadness of industrial society. Like Blake, Keats, and Whitman, D. H. Lawrence

believed that 'the holiness of the heart's affection' (Keat's phrase) could revolutionize society, could transform the 'dark Satanic mills', the hated cities, the industrial squalor and impersonality which Lawrence identified as the enemy of the free human spirit.

It is a complete misreading of Lawrence to see him as obsessed with sex. Malcolm Muggeridge was merely being vulgar and smart when he said that Lawrence believed in 'salvation through fornication'. No man had a cleaner mind or a more withering contempt for smut or promiscuity. One of the most lyrical passages in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* celebrates the virtue of chastity! The book is more conspicuous for its wonderfully precise and poetic descriptions of Nature, and by contrast, its devastating delineation of modern industrial ugliness, than for its allegedly 'sexual' preoccupation. Indeed if there is one criticism that must be made of the novel it is that it is too obviously symbolic—sex being a symbol for the imprisoned energies of men, and the affair between Lady Chatterley and Mellors the gamekeeper representing Lawrence's dream of the union of the best in the English liberal intellectual class and the old yeoman stock.

Lawrence was prophetic, too, not only in his insight into the malady of our time, but in his preaching, in season and out of season, of the remedy. He did not despise reason; what he hated and fought was autonomous reason, reason divorced from feeling and sensitiveness, a cut-flower uprooted from the soil of man's total life. He deplored only the smart-alec 'knowingness', the sterile intellectualism, of the age, and prayed to be delivered from it.

'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

But it is a much more fearful thing to fall out of them . . .

Save me, O God, from falling into the ungodly knowledge

Of myself as I am without God.

Let me never know, O God,

Let me never know what I am or should be

When I have fallen out of your hands, the hands of the living God.'

If man is to recover his living wholeness, his ability to respond to life in freedom and spontaneity, he must learn to live with the darkness within him. This word 'darkness' is a key word in all Lawrence's writings (see especially 'Bavarian Gentians' in *Collected Poems*, iii. 139 and 'Terra Incognita', 104). This man, who saw the natural world with a clarity, a sharpness, an exactness almost unparalleled in modern literature, also insisted again and again on the healing and quickening power of darkness. Like the psalmist

he says of God, 'Clouds and darkness are round about Him', and again 'He made darkness His secret place, his pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds'. And with the prophet Isaiah he makes God say, 'I will give unto thee the treasures of darkness, and the hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I am . . . the Lord'. Man must learn to draw upon these 'hidden riches' by recognizing the vast mystery that surrounds his own little conscious life and by developing, not only his lately-acquired intelligence, but his instinctive and emotional life which has been too much ignored in our culture. The philosopher, John MacMurray, is obviously drawing heavily upon D. H. Lawrence when he pleads for 'the education of the emotions', and there are pages in *Reason and Emotion* which reflect the influence upon the Scottish scholar of such a typical passage as: 'How different they are, mental feelings and real feelings. To-day many people live and die without having had any real feelings—though they have had a "rich emotional life" apparently, having showed strong mental feeling, but it is all counterfeit. We are to-day, creatures whose active emotional self has no real existence, but all is reflected downward from the mind. Our education from the start has taught us a certain range of emotions, what to feel and what not to feel, and how to feel the feelings we allow ourselves to feel. All the rest is just non-existent . . . the higher emotions are strictly dead. They have to be faked' (*à propos Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 233, *Sex, Literature and Censorship* [Heinemann]).

But 'darkness' also stands for the recognition that all real knowing involves self-abandonment. We know the truth about anything only insofar as we enter into union with it, and are therefore prepared to surrender our egotism. There is something very reminiscent here of Martin Buber's I-thou encounter, and even more of Saint Paul's demand that we be buried with Christ in baptism, entering into the darkness of self-loss in order to rise again in newness of life. Every act of knowing, every meeting with another, poses a challenge to my clinging to life, calls for an act of what the old mystics called self-noughting. Lawrence has expressed this in many ways, notably in his short poems, 'Change', and 'The Phoenix':

Are you willing to be sponged out, erased, cancelled?  
made nothing?

Are you willing to be made nothing?  
dipped into oblivion?

If not, you will never really change.

And without that change, he suggests again and again throughout his novels and poems, no real meeting of mind with mind, of person with person, is possible. Love, for Lawrence, is no mere sentiment

of unrestrained passion; it involves the offering to another of a mature and non-grasping self.

## II

That Lawrence was a deeply religious man is evident, not only from his own confession, but in every line he ever wrote. In the novel *Kangaroo* he makes his character say: 'Life makes no absolute statements. It is all Call and Answer. As soon as the Call ceases the Answer is invalid. And till the Answer comes, a Call is but a crying in the wilderness. . . . A man's soul is a perpetual Call and Answer' (p. 295). But he grew to manhood in an environment where religion had become moralistic and static, and against that kind of religion his soul rebelled. In one of the very last pieces of writing he did, a review of Eric Gill's book, he said: 'The Catholic Church has fallen into the same disaster as the Protestant: of preaching a moral God, instead of Almighty God, the God of strength and glory and might and wisdom; a "good" God instead of a vital and magnificent God. To most of us to-day (God) is a fetish word, dead, yet useful for invocation. We have to square ourselves with the very words. And to do so we must rid them of their maddening moral import, and give them back—Almighty God—their old vital meaning: strength and glory and honour and might and beauty and wisdom.'

Dr. F. R. Leavis, the Cambridge critic, exclaimed on one occasion: 'I can never forgive the Christians for not realizing that Lawrence was on their side!' To Leavis it seemed obvious that Lawrence had penetrated to the heart of the Christian religion more inwardly and profoundly than many in the churches. 'The birth, the baptism, the temptation, Gethsemane, the betrayal, the crucifixion, the burial and resurrection are all true according to our inward experience,' said Lawrence, and complained that the churches had turned them into historical memories and intellectual doctrines. In his remarkable essay, *The Risen Lord*, he pleads for a return to the full-blooded proclamation of what we nowadays call 'the kerygma': 'To preach Christ crucified is to preach half the truth. It is the business of the Church to preach Christ born among men—which is Christmas; Christ crucified, which is Good Friday; and Christ risen, which is Easter. And after Easter, till November and All Saints, and till Annunciation, the year belongs to the Risen Lord.'

'The Roman Church has given us the Christ-child in the lap of a woman, and, again, Christ crucified . . . the mystery of atonement through sacrifice. Yet all this is really preparatory to the real living religion . . . living in the risen body

. . . Christ risen in the flesh. We must take the mystery in its fulness and in fact.'

In all this, Lawrence is far from repudiating Christianity, what he is repudiating is the sentimental and moralistic religion of his nonconformist upbringing. Yet even of this, Lawrence could write nostalgically and appreciatively in his later years: 'I think it was good to be brought up a Protestant, and among Protestants a Nonconformist, and among Nonconformists, a Congregationalist, which sounds pharisaic. But I should have missed bitterly a direct knowledge of the Bible, and a direct relation to Galilee and Canaan, Moab and Kedron, those places that never existed on earth.' When he came to write his short novel, *The Man Who Died*, an imaginative reconstruction of the Resurrection and what followed it, he showed well his 'direct relation to Galilee and Canaan, Moab and Kedron'. With the brilliance worthy of a Bultmann, he 'de-mythologizes' the Resurrection, only to 're-mythologize' it in such a way as to confront his readers with the call to decision—for life or against, for life 'in Christ' or life tied to the maxims of a dead Jesus.

There are many who regard Lawrence's daring reconstruction as blasphemy, not realizing that it is in truth a poetic fable, in which he expresses his faith in the inwardness of the Christian religion, and calls the Church to a deeper practice of its own faith. It is not really a life of Christ, but an imaginative forecast of what a Resurrection-believing Church would be like were it to take seriously the Risen Christ. Jesus came out of the tomb to take fresh possession of the world of Nature, delivered at length from the necessity of being a preacher, messiah, saviour, able at last to be a Man among men! Is not this the hope of the Church also? Do we not all long for the time when the intolerable necessity of being 'benefactors', 'guides', 'preachers', gives place to real, unencumbered relations with our fellow-men? And in Lawrence's bold presentation of the meeting and marriage of the Risen Christ with the priestess of Isis, we have, it seems to me, a deeply wrought symbol of the coming together of Christianity and the religions of the East—these no longer in conflict, nor seeking for an eclectic compromise, but reaching a fuller understanding of one another through the attempt to live in holy wedlock.

The significance of D. H. Lawrence for our age is by no means exhausted. There is, indeed, a sense in which we are in a better position to understand the racked and tormented, but deeply religious, prophetic figure than his own immediate contemporaries, both because the evil of which he was so keenly aware has come to fuller fruition, and because we, too, have sensed the inadequacy of the moralistic and legalistic religion against which he strove.

# Modern Issues in Biblical Studies

## Christian Existentialism in the New Testament

BY THE REVEREND JOHN MACQUARRIE, B.D., PH.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

ANYONE who is asked to write on the theme announced in the title of this article must first take a closer look at the title itself, for it seems to commit him to certain assumptions. One assumption is that there is a variety of existentialism which can properly be called 'Christian'; another assumption is that this Christian existentialism is to be found in the New Testament. Both assumptions are sufficiently important to demand a few preliminary words of explanation.

Is there a Christian existentialism? Obviously some types of philosophy are more sympathetic to Christianity than others, but there is no one type that is wholly Christian. At the beginning of the century many people supposed that idealism is the philosophical ally of Christian faith. Yet, at the hands of its ablest British exponents—Bradley, Bosanquet, and McTaggart—idealism turned out to be antagonistic to Christianity, or at least to its traditional formulations. By 'existentialism' is meant the type of philosophy which concerns itself with human existence and which tries to understand this existence out of the concrete experience which, as existents, we all have. As a way of philosophizing rather than a body of doctrine, existentialism as such is neither for nor against Christianity. In a writer like Jean-Paul Sartre, with his morbid egocentricity and his preoccupation with sex, we find a version of existentialism which is antipathetic to Christianity. On the other hand, if a philosopher were to take the Christian life as the norm of human existence and were to derive his conception of existence from a questioning of Christian existence, he would be a Christian existentialist. Thus there can be a Christian existentialism.

Is there Christian existentialism in the New Testament? In one sense it is anachronistic to speak of existentialism in the New Testament, for it is plain that the New Testament authors did not take human existence as an explicit problem for philosophical analysis in the way in which modern existentialists do. In another sense, however, it may be permissible to speak of existentialism in the New Testament if what the sacred authors did was to set forth, even if not explicitly, a way of understanding this human existence which belongs to each of us and for which each of us is responsible. But as religious

writers, were they not concerned to tell us about God, angels, and the beyond, rather than about human existence? One of Rudolf Bultmann's critics, L. Malevez, says: 'The Bible is not primarily a treatise on anthropology; its whole aim is the knowledge of God and the contemplation of God'.<sup>1</sup> This is, of course, quite true. But as Calvin reminds us, the Christian knowledge of God is a knowledge not of 'God as He is in Himself, but as He is towards us'.<sup>2</sup> This is exactly what Bultmann seeks to express in more startling form in his latest book: 'The question of God and the question of myself are identical'.<sup>3</sup> It is not a matter of deciding whether the New Testament is about God or man, for it considers the two together. Its teaching is always oriented to human existence, and in so far as it presents us with an understanding of this existence—even if it asks us to look beyond the confines of a merely human existence for such an understanding—we can properly speak of an 'existentialism' in the New Testament.

The task of constructing a Christian existentialism would lie in making explicit the conception of Christian existence given in Christian teaching and experienced in the Christian life. Christian teaching, however, comes to us in various forms—for instance, as myth, history, dogma. The task is to translate these various forms of discourse into statements which concern our existence. This is to be done in accordance with definite hermeneutical principles, of which the chief are that we should ask questions relating to existence and formulate the answers in existential categories.<sup>4</sup> The procedure may be illustrated in relation to each of the three kinds of discourse mentioned.

First, let us consider *myth*, which, in this context, we shall take to mean those religious stories which are *in principle* unverifiable as factual history. An example is provided by the eschatological elements in the New Testament. The essence of this myth was taken over by the first Christians from Jewish apocalyptic. Their

<sup>1</sup> *The Christian Message and Myth* [1958], 157.

<sup>2</sup> *Institutes*, I. ii.

<sup>3</sup> *Jesus Christ and Mythology* [1958], 53.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Bultmann's essay, 'The Problem of Hermeneutics', in *Essays—Philosophical and Theological* (tr. J. C. G. Greig [1955]), 234 ff.

belief was that the world would shortly come to an end through a supernatural intervention; that there would be a final judgment; and that as a result of this judgment, men would go either to everlasting bliss or everlasting torment. The first disciples' expectation of an imminent end was falsified, and to modern minds the whole belief, if taken at all literally, looks like a piece of Jewish superstition. As Bultmann somewhat brashly puts it, 'History did not come to an end, and, as every schoolboy knows, it will continue to run its course'.<sup>1</sup> If history ever does come to an end, it will be through some natural cause. If however we now apply the canons of existential interpretation to the eschatological myth, we can begin to make sense of it. Its ideas will be related to the here and now of actual individual existence. Every individual stands before the imminent end—his own death; in his everyday decisions about the existence for which he is responsible, he works out his own judgment; here and now he either lays hold on his true being or he loses it. Understood in this way, eschatology ceases to be merely a curious belief from the remote past. It recovers its note of urgency and responsibility, and this, we may suppose, was its existential significance for those who in primitive Christianity gave credence to the myth. The same procedure of demythologizing can be applied to other mythical elements in Christian teaching.

We pass now, however, to those assertions about *history* which also form a part of Christian teaching. These historical assertions differ from myths in that they are at least in principle verifiable and may be assigned a definite place in world-history. The historical element in Christianity centres in the story of Jesus Christ, and especially in His cross and resurrection.<sup>2</sup> What meaning can still be attached to these events of nineteen centuries ago? Again we may apply the canons of existential interpretation and ask how they are related to the here and now of your existence or mine. R. G. Collingwood asks: 'What is history for?' He suggests as the answer: 'History is for human self-knowledge'.<sup>3</sup> The past event becomes relevant to our existence when it is in some sense 're-enacted' in our present historicity, when it is understood as disclosing a possible kind of existence for us now. We really believe in the cross of Christ when we

ourselves 'take up the cross' and in so doing experience a 'rising' from the death of sin into a new life of the spirit. This is atonement, reconciliation with one's true being and with God.

A similar approach holds for *dogma*. What, for instance, is meant by the statement that Christ is God? Is the assertion of Christ's divinity to be understood as the objective statement of a metaphysical mystery—the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father? If so, it is the kind of belief to which one could give intellectual assent without being involved in any kind of religious commitment. Prior to all metaphysical speculation on the natures of Christ and His relation to the Father came the existential commitment of the believer to Christ, expressed in the confession of His Godhood. To say that Christ is God is not only to say something about Christ, but to say something about oneself, to declare one's attitude to Him, to recognize Him as one's 'ultimate concern' and the revelation of God in the flesh.<sup>4</sup>

Such are the bare bones of a Christian existentialism. It visualizes man as responsible for a finite existence in the face of death. It finds the way to wholeness and salvation in an existential commitment to the work and person of Christ. A developed Christian existentialism would relate all Christian teaching to these central themes of existence, and would present the full conception of Christianity as man's authentic mode of existing. Such a project would take us far beyond the limits of this essay. We must be content with the sketch that has been given, and return to the other main aspect of our theme—Christian existentialism in the New Testament. Is the existentialist interpretation of myth, history, and dogma alien to the intentions of the New Testament writers themselves, so that it has to be forced upon them, so to speak? Or does it have an adequate basis of support in these writers themselves? To determine this point, we shall go over the three topics again, paying special attention this time to the New Testament writers.

The existentialist interpretation of the eschatological myth may be claimed to derive support especially from the author of the Fourth Gospel. Bultmann goes so far as to say that in this writing we already find the beginnings of demythologizing. We may quote a few sentences from a distinguished commentator, C. K. Barrett. 'It is clear from consideration of the passages in which eternal life is mentioned that the concept retains something of its eschatological connexion, but also that it may equally be thought of as a *present* gift of God'.

<sup>4</sup> For a fuller discussion, see Bultmann's essay, 'The Christological Confession of the World Council of Churches', in *Essays*, 273 ff.

<sup>1</sup> 'New Testament and Mythology', in *Kerygma and Myth* (tr. R. H. Fuller [1953]), 5.

<sup>2</sup> Bultmann, of course, assigns the Resurrection to the realm of myth, and treats only the Cross as history. There is no space to go into this matter here, and for a discussion I may be permitted to refer the reader to my book, *An Existentialist Theology* [1955], 166–92.

<sup>3</sup> *The Idea of History* [1946], 10.

Again, in a comparison of the Synoptic and Johannine conceptions of judgment, we are told that in the Fourth Gospel 'the judgment is no longer primarily future but proceeds *continuously*'.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Barrett, of course, rightly emphasizes that the author had not abandoned the common New Testament eschatology, and that he looked for a future judgment as well as the present one. It is, however, important that he has abandoned a *purely* future eschatology, and has begun to apply the ideas of the myth to present human existence. It was already said that it would be an anachronism to look for an explicit existentialism in the New Testament. In this teaching of the Fourth Gospel, however, we do find something like an implicit existentialism. Mythical and existential ways of thinking had not yet been sorted out, but the existential significance of the myth is already asserting itself. Nowadays, for us who no longer look for a supernatural cataclysmic end of the world (even if we may still look for some ultimate consummation of the Divine purposes), it is the existential significance of the myth that alone remains as the permanent element of value in it.

Passing to the existential interpretation of the historical events of the Cross and Resurrection, we find the clearest prototype of this in the teaching of St. Paul. It is true that already in the sayings of Jesus we are bidden to 'take up the cross'.<sup>2</sup> But the idea of dying, rising, and living with Christ, of somehow participating in His death and resurrection, is presented with extraordinary power in the Pauline Epistles. Commenting on St. Paul's use of such expressions, another notable New Testament scholar, Vincent Taylor, says: 'It is to St. Paul above all others that the Church owes the idea, absolutely vital to a true apprehension of the doctrine of the atonement, of fellowship with the Redeemer in the realities of His saving ministry'.<sup>3</sup> Of course, as Dr. Taylor points out, St. Paul thought of the cross of Christ in many other ways besides. Not all of them are easily harmonized and some are frankly meaningless to the modern mind, or at the best evocative images. As with the author of the Fourth Gospel, existentialism is present only implicitly in St. Paul, and mingles with mythological and other ways of thinking. But here, again, it may be that it is the existential significance of his thought that has permanent value; and that it is through a 'dying' and 'rising' with Christ that we can understand an event of nineteen centuries ago as a present atonement for us.

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel according to St. John* [1956], 179, 403.

<sup>2</sup> Mk 8<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching* [1940], 100.

Coming to the question of dogma, and of Christological dogma in particular, it surely needs no long argument to show that the titles given to Christ by the earliest Christians were not attempts to define His metaphysical status. This problem arose only long afterwards. In using such titles as 'Messiah' or 'Lord' or 'Son of Man', the early disciples were trying to express no abstruse doctrine but the significance of Christ for their existence, and to do this they drew upon such concepts as were already available to them. All of these concepts, of course, had their own peculiar associations. The word *κύριος*, for instance, had its history both in the Septuagint and in the Hellenistic religions, and presumably carried the connotation of divinity in a religious context. But surely the primitive confession of Jesus Christ as Lord was a declaration of the disciples' attitude to Christ before it was interpreted as a metaphysical statement about Christ. Bultmann remarks: 'The pronouncements about Jesus' divinity are not, in fact, pronouncements of His nature but seek to give expression to His significance'.<sup>4</sup> When such pronouncements are objectified, we tend to run into what Luther called a mere 'sophistical' knowledge of Christ, lacking in any kind of religious commitment. Luther said of the scholastics that they 'had depicted Christ as God and man, had counted His bones and arms and mixed His natures wonderfully together'. He goes on to say: 'Christ is not named Christ because He has two natures. What meaning has that for me? But He bears His lordly and comforting names because of the office and work He has taken on Himself'.<sup>5</sup>

Enough has been said to show that what may be fairly called an 'existential' mode of thinking has its significant place in the New Testament. If then we have seen what, in outline, a Christian existentialism is, and if we have also seen that this way of presenting Christianity has its right as something which is rooted in the thought of the New Testament writers themselves, it remains to say something of the value and importance which a Christian existentialism may be judged to possess.

And, first, it should be said that no exaggerated claim for a Christian existentialism should be made. Any particular way of interpreting Christianity begins to look merely foolish if it is claimed to be the *only* way. The remarkable power and vitality of the Christian faith is attested by the fact that it continues to yield new interpretations in every age, but no single interpretation has finality or grasps the faith in its entirety. For instance, I would be unhappy with a purely

<sup>4</sup> *Essays*, 280.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by Sydney Cave in *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ* [1925], 141.

existential interpretation of the sacred history, and the 'Gnosticism' to which it would lead, and I should want to ask some questions about factual history. Again, I would be unhappy with a purely existential interpretation of dogma, for dogma, at least when taken as a whole, has an ontological sense as well.<sup>1</sup> The claim for Christian existentialism must be a limited one.

Yet within its limits a Christian existentialism looks like the most promising way of presenting the truths of Christianity in our time. It has made

<sup>1</sup> These topics are discussed in detail in my forthcoming book, *The Scope of Demythologizing* [S.C.M.].

sense of some things that had become senseless, and it has given a new relevance and intelligibility to a faith which has been tending to fade away in the Western world. Moreover, it is firmly grounded in the New Testament. It is, therefore, difficult to understand the prejudices which seem to be so prevalent against the idea of a Christian existentialism. Even if its insights are no more final and complete than those of any other type of religious thought, it is surely better to explore the new avenues opened up by the contemporary existentialists than to persist in flogging dead horses.

## In the Study

### Virginibus Puerisque

#### Palm Sunday

BY THE REVEREND JOHN G. WILLIAMS, M.A.,  
S.P.C.K., LONDON

WHEN, in these days, the commander of a victorious army enters a conquered city in triumph, he generally rides in a tank, or a jeep, or a high-powered car. In the old days, he would have been seated on a prancing war-horse, because the horse was always a symbol of war and conquest.

This helps to explain why many people in that Palm Sunday crowd must have been puzzled and angry when Jesus rode into Jerusalem on the back of a donkey. For years they had been praying and waiting for the coming of the Messiah, the long-expected Deliverer of their enslaved country, who would raise a powerful army and lead a victorious campaign against the hated Roman forces of occupation and drive them out at the point of the sword; and when Jesus came He looked like being the great military commander they were so much longing for. They pinned their hopes on Him. It was obvious that if Jesus had chosen to lead an armed revolt thousands of bloodthirsty young hot-heads would have rushed to join Him. Some of them, like Simon the Zealot (a member of a revolutionary party), had already done so. Several times during the previous three years they had tried to persuade Jesus to lead a rebellion. You remember, for example, the time when they tried to make Him king by force; and even His closest friends, the ones who knew and understood Him best, went on thinking right up to the last minute that Jesus intended to fight. In fact they thought that was His main purpose in going up to Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. That is why later on Judas, thinking that Jesus was delaying too long, did his best to force the issue; and when in the Garden of Gethsemane Jesus actually forbade His men to

fight and told them to put up their swords, they were so disappointed and perplexed that they simply ran off in a panic and deserted Him.

If Jesus had ridden into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday on a war-horse it would have made it as clear as daylight that He intended to lead an armed rising against the Romans. But that is just exactly what He did *not* do. In fact, He deliberately did something quite unmistakably different—He dramatically enacted the character of the gentle Messiah (the bringer of peace and justice, described by the prophet Zechariah)<sup>1</sup> by riding into Jerusalem on the back of an ordinary donkey. Many of the onlookers must have found that stupid and exasperating. In those days, just as the horse was a symbol of war, so the donkey was a symbol of peace. Soldiers and great military commanders did not ride on donkeys. It was simple, peaceful folk, like peasants and farmers and merchants, who rode on donkeys.

The people who understood what Jesus meant by doing that and admired Him for it greeted Him with palms and shouts of 'Hosanna!' They knew that Jesus was coming to bring not war, but peace. He had, indeed, come as a conqueror and a deliverer, but He had come to conquer the evil things in the world, sin and disease and injustice: He had come to deliver people from misery and suffering and hatred and to give them the only real peace. That was the whole point of His triumphal procession into Jerusalem—and that was what He was deliberately trying to make plain. But there were others in that vast crowd who did not understand—or, if they did, they thought it was weak and silly and dangerous. They were angry and frustrated because Jesus had disappointed them; and they must have been among the ones who on the following Friday cried 'Crucify him' and hounded Him to the Cross.

<sup>1</sup> Zec 9<sup>9</sup>.

But we know now that, in spite of the Cross, Palm Sunday really was the triumphant procession of a mighty conqueror; because on Easter Day Jesus came back from the grave alive, and ever since then He has been with us in the world helping us to fight and overcome all those evil things, in ourselves and in the world, which He came to conquer and destroy.

### Hands !

BY H. F. MATHEWS, M.A., PH.D.,  
KIDDERMINSTER

'And being moved with compassion, he stretched forth his hand.'—Mk 1<sup>41</sup> (R.V.).

'Hands !', I guess, makes you think of twenty-two men on a muddy field, and ten thousand raucous voices yelling their vast disapproval. But in my humble opinion the ball in that game is the wrong shape, so I am not going to talk about it. Follow me for a moment, and you will see what 'Hands !' brings to my mind.

Have you received any letters in the last few months? Yes? Well, think of the stamp in the top right hand corner. How was it 'franked'? I mean what design had the post office chaps printed over it alongside the name of the office and the date and time of posting? A set of seven wavy lines? That would have been the right answer this time last year. But just now the post office is using a new symbol. It is an open hand. Do you know why?

Dame Laura Knight has designed that hand symbol to remind us that this is World Refugee Year, when we are all trying in different ways to help the vast army of homeless, helpless people in Europe and Korea and the Arab lands who have been rendered hopeless by illness and the tragic wars and disturbances of the last twenty years.

I know many churches and Sunday schools where they have had special collections for the cause. Fine. I know some where they have taken cards and boxes and invited other people to help. That's even better. I know a few where they have organized concerts and devoted the proceeds to the Refugee Year funds. Better still. And I have heard of one or two groups who have said, 'We'll make things', and they have got going with their needles and thread, or they have borrowed dad's tools, or they have set up as special car-cleaners (dirty job, this), or have even scrounged some old boxes and chopped them up to sell as firewood—refugee firewood, of course. Perhaps that is best of all. They have used their hands, and those hands will take help.

Look carefully at the hand which is drawn on your envelope. It is not a beautiful, delicately tended hand, with long, tapering fingers. Dame

Laura has drawn for us the hand of an ordinary man. The palm has been calloused by toil, and the fingers are uneven, as though they have often been strained in hard muscular effort. It was just the reminder we needed.

Many of the preachers have wondered what the hands of Jesus were like. We can be sure that they were strong hands, used to the strain of the carpenter's tools. Somewhere there is a legend about them. You know how, when a baby is lying in its pram, the women-folk come along and admire it. It is almost certain that someone will put out a finger or a pencil for the baby to grip, and it is just as certain that the Bundle will grasp it and close its tiny hand round it and gurgle with delight: it seems that we humans start grabbing at things almost from the word 'go'. But, the legend says, when they put out fingers for the Baby Jesus to grasp, His hands never closed round them. His hands were always open, never trying to clutch things for Himself.

The tightly closed fist seems to say one of two things: either it is 'Go away: this is mine', or else 'Look out, or I'll punch your nose'. The open hand says, 'Tell me, how can I help?'

I don't suppose the legend is true. I don't see how anyone could know a thing like that. But words like those of our text make it clear that the need of men always moved our Lord to help. He did not stand by in useless pity, not even when the needy person was a man suffering from the filthy skin disease Mark tells us about. 'He stretched forth his hand.' His hands were open hands.

In a few weeks we shall recall once more our Lord's Passion. We shall know how He met at last our greatest need, and how far His compassion drew Him. It isn't great poetry, but I think I shall read again Ann Gilbert's hymn with its two lines:

And those kind hands that did such good,  
They nailed them to a cross of wood.

### The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT

#### This Dignity on Which We Stand

BY THE REVEREND R. T. HALLIDAY, B.D.,  
ST. ANDREWS

'Jesus said to them, Do you know what I have done to you? You call me Teacher and Lord; and you are right, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet.'—Jn 13<sup>12-14</sup> (R.S.V.).

The account of the washing of the disciples' feet by our Lord stands in the Fourth Gospel where the

account of the Last Supper stands in the others. St. John, the most sacramentally-minded of all the Gospel writers, simply assumes that the details of the Last Supper are known to his readers, and proceeds to draw out some of the implications of the events on the night before the Crucifixion, packing his account, as he constantly does, with significant words and subtle references that start many different trains of thought in our minds as we read his words.

When He washed His disciples' feet, our Lord performed a symbolic act. He did something visible which represented an eternal fact, just the way the Old Testament prophets used to do. On Palm Sunday we commemorate His Triumphant Entry into Jerusalem, which was another symbolic act of our Lord: He did something visible—rode into the capital on the back of an ass—which represented an eternal fact (the peaceable Kingship and Messianic status of Christ). In the same way, the night before His crucifixion, He washed the feet of the Twelve, symbolizing the eternal truth that Christ purifies men, washing away their sins—that the purification, the cleansing that through the ages men have longed for, *is available* in Christ. Perhaps, too, the choice presented to Peter, bewildered, ashamed, and scandalised—the choice 'Be cleansed, refreshed, and renewed on *My* terms or not at all'—is much the same choice that Christ presents to us. But that is one of those meaningful asides of St. John, and we must leave it to some other sermon!

So, then, Christ's washing of His disciples' feet was a symbolic act, signifying His power to cleanse men, and in this aspect He alone could have done it—the act would not have had this significance if one of the Twelve had washed their feet. But there is another side to it, which Jesus brought home to them in the words which are our text. In washing their feet, He had given them an example which they were to follow.

In the ancient world, to wash the feet of the guests was the duty of a slave. Among the Jews, who had never depended to anything like the same extent on slavery, it was the family duty of a wife to her husband and of children to their parents. It was an act of intimate courtesy, and when our Lord and His disciples were 'doing' for themselves, as they were that night, it would have fallen naturally to the least of the Twelve to wash the feet of the other twelve people in the room. But no one had done it. For the fact was that on this night before our Lord went to His redeeming death, not one of the Twelve was prepared to see himself as the least of the party. Each one had some one else in mind for the task, and we can imagine the resentment and self-justification that was at the back of the mind of each of

them. All twelve of them were standing on their dignity.

And it was at this point, when it had been tacitly and sullenly agreed that it wouldn't be done at all, that our Lord Himself got up from the table and took off His ordinary clothes, and put round Himself the towel of a Roman slave, and began to wash the feet of His twelve disciples. How pointed are St. John's words! 'Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going to God, rose from supper, laid aside his garments, and girded himself with a towel.' God Incarnate, about to return to the glory of His Father, did what their dignity prevented them from doing, and in doing it showed them the emptiness, the arrogance, the wickedness of their imagined dignity.

Yet He was not content to show them this. He insisted upon making clear the implications of His action. 'You call me Rabbi and Lord; and you are right, for so I am.' Rabbi was the title accorded to a renowned Jewish teacher, equivalent in honour to our style, 'Professor'. And a Jewish Rabbi could expect the service of feet-washing from His disciples. Lord was a Gentile word, the title of kings and emperors. And the Emperor could expect this service from his servants. 'If I then, your Lord and Rabbi, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet.' And in that sentence, the washing of feet becomes a metaphor, standing for an attitude of mind, an attitude of mind devoid of dignity, not only towards God, which is obvious, but towards each other, which is often exceedingly hard. This attitude, which belongs to the life of Christ, is part also of the life *in* Christ. To stand on our dignity towards each other is to make out that we are of more importance than our Lord.

There are three kinds of dignity. There is the kind of dignity people stand on, as the disciples did that night, commonly called 'giving oneself airs'. And if you examine the Gospels, you will find that whenever Christ came across this kind of dignity He quite deliberately and mercilessly destroyed it. This kind of dignity is the personal enemy of Christ.

And, then, there is a second kind of dignity, which is a much less selfish thing in itself, and which is dearly prized by us all. That is the dignity which is accorded to us by others, the spontaneous esteem accorded by our fellows. Now this is a very precious thing, and by no means to be despised. But, like happiness, it is something that is attained in the by-going, and not by aiming directly at it. To become fond of being thought well of by others is to become a man-pleaser instead of a God-server, one who in fact has

turned back to the first kind of dignity and is really preoccupied with a sense of his own importance.

There is, however, a third kind of dignity, which is to be earnestly and humbly sought after by us all—dignity in the sight of God, who created and who redeemed us. Before *this* kind of dignity, both the question of our standing in our own eyes, and that of our standing in the eyes of others, pale into insignificance. What matters is our status in the sight of God: this is what the New Testament calls 'righteousness'—a right standing with God, which is His gift to those who trust Him for it. This is the only kind of dignity that is real, that can stand before the Throne, that a Christian may seek. This dignity-in-his-sight which God gives is diametrically opposed to any kind of dignity we can try to create for ourselves. We must choose which we want, for we cannot have them both. The disciples had stood upon their own dignity, and Christ's humility had shown them their emptiness. Yet Christ renounced all human dignity, and in His self-abasement retained and manifested His glory. And He tells us to-day, as He told the Twelve on the eve of His death, that this attitude is to be theirs and ours.

'Do you know what I have done to you? You call me Rabbi and Lord; and you are right, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Rabbi, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet.'

---

#### PASSION SUNDAY

#### The Cross in the Garden

BY THE REVEREND JOHN B. NETTLESHIP,  
B.A., B.D., LEEDS

Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden.'—Jn 19<sup>41</sup>.

In *Jesus and Ourselves* Dr. Leslie Weatherhead has pointed out how savage races have indulged in bestial orgies, 'while all around them Nature spreads out before their unseeing eyes, the most perfect scenery which God's world contains'. So it was at Golgotha: 'In the place where he was crucified there was a garden'.

These vivid words show us, first, that man may be utterly insensitive to beauty. This is revealed in all kinds of ways in common life—in the commercialism of so many beauty spots, with their cafés, fun-fairs, filling-stations, and slot-machines; in the sheer vandalism which seems increasingly common—someone plants trees, and

someone else breaks off the branches, or someone plants flowers and someone else pulls them up and scatters the wilting blossoms on the highway; in the litter of papers and bottles and tin cans in grassy meadows, and along river banks. We put a lot of it down to 'thoughtlessness', but it is more than that; it is utter insensitiveness to beauty. The beauty of a place can never really have sunk into a man's soul if he can behave like this.

But, of course, the incident which John describes so graphically represents very much more than a casual and thoughtless insensitivity to the beauty of Nature. It is doubtful whether they really *saw* the Garden at all; they saw only the Cross. There it stood—the gaunt, grim, tangible symbol of what they regarded as their victory. Hatred blinded them—not only to the beauty of the Garden, but to the beauty of Christ Himself, of His life and ministry. His words of truth and power, His compassion towards the sick and needy, His love for all sorts and conditions of men, the beauty and purity of His life and character—all these might never have existed at all as far as His enemies were concerned.

This is the grim lesson of the Cross—hatred, bigotry, and pride can blind men to all that is good and true and holy in life. May God, in His mercy, deliver us from this spirit which warps the judgment, poisons the mind, and blinds us to beauty of every kind. It is love which opens the eyes to hidden and unexpected beauties. We see this principle at work in the life of Jesus Himself; because He loved people, He saw far more in them than others saw; He saw their divine potentialities. Those whom others despised and dismissed as 'publicans and sinners' Jesus saw as sons and daughters of God.

The Garden and the Cross remind us of the possibilities which life offers us—to mar beauty with our ugly crosses, or to plant gardens amid the havoc which men have wrought.

But the Cross and the Garden remind us also of the inevitable mixture and contrast which life presents. Side by side, in all our experience is the joy that 'is touched with pain'. Some ask that life should be a garden in the perpetual bloom of summer. Yet in so asking, how little they understand of the true meaning and purpose of life. It is strange, yet true, that when men's thoughts now turn to this Garden of the Bible, it is not the ancient trees, or the flowers in which they find comfort for sorrow, or strength for temptation, or peace amid the strain and tension of life. It is the Cross which speaks to their need. The Garden has lived in history; travellers still make their pious, loving pilgrimage to it. But not because it is a garden, but because there was a Cross there! If there had been no Cross there, we should never

have heard of this Garden. Here is something which the human mind cannot completely grasp, but clearly, in the purpose and Providence of God, suffering can achieve in these characters of ours something which can be achieved in no other way. Even for Jesus Himself this is part of the essential nature of experience. 'For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.'

Often, when we speak of someone's outstanding character or achievements as being 'in spite of his suffering', ought we not really to say, 'because of his suffering'? This is a Divine and mysterious alchemy, but its power and reality are undeniable. It is doubtful whether any of us ever learns the true meaning of life until we have learned to say with Adelaide Proctor—

We thank Thee more that all our joy  
Is touched with pain, . . .  
So that earth's bliss may be our guide  
And not our chain.

'Chain!' That's it! Some people are 'in bondage' to happiness. They think it is the 'be-all' and 'end-all' of life. They sacrifice all else in the hope of achieving this. They think that if they could rid life of its shadows, thorns, and crosses they would be happier people. That is doubtful; certainly, they would not be better people, for, in the grace of God, the hard experiences of life are those which mould our faith and character, and in bearing our cross, we see into the very heart of God.

But while we think about the Cross, we must not forget the Garden. The writer remembers a bombed building in one of our great northern cities, after 'the Blitz'. Twisted steel girders, great stone blocks tumbled upon each other, piles of rubble—a grim reminder of man's inhumanity to man. So, it remained for months—an ugly scar on the heart of a city. Then Spring came. And in the crevices of the stones were flowers, and in the gloomy cavern of what had been the basement of the buildings, was a soft green carpet of grass. In the place of desolation and destruction—there was a garden.

That is a symbol of Passiontide. We see the blind hatred of the religious leaders, the cowardly 'neutrality' of Pilate, the treachery of the betrayer, the callousness of the Roman soldiers—what ugly things! But there, too, we see the courage and dignity of Christ, the love which took Him even to the Cross, the prayer for the forgiveness of His enemies. What priceless blooms these are! 'In the place where he was crucified there was a garden.'

## PALM SUNDAY

### Christ is King

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL  
CHARLES S. DUTHIE, D.D., EDINBURGH

'And when he was come nigh, even now at the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen; Saying, Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. And some of the Pharisees from among the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples. And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.'—Lk 19<sup>27-40</sup>.

During the Second World War, when the desert battles were over and victory within the allied grasp, I remember walking from Bethany over the Mount of Olives into Jerusalem. It was a lovely morning in Spring. The sun shone upon this city of three faiths, and as it came into my view, I felt compelled to sit down and take my fill of it. I read once again the accounts given by the gospel writers of our Lord's last, fateful entry. As I read and looked about me, it seemed plain that Christ's approach on the city could not have been other than dramatic. Like the Baptism and the Temptation, like the Transfiguration and the Agony in the Garden, like the Crucifixion itself, it stands out as one of the decisive moments of His ministry. Yet the outward aspects of the drama—the palm branches and the cheering crowds and the obstructing Pharisees—were only the echoes of the great conflict that was being waged in the soul of our Lord as He battled for the world's salvation.

We miss the genuine drama of this remarkable advance upon the Holy City if we think of it simply as a predetermined path which Jesus was compelled to accept. Tillich has said that in God destiny and freedom coincide. Is this not true of Jesus? On the one side, the Gospels portray His last days as unswerving loyalty to His vocation. As the Servant Son of God He could not do other than He did. On the other side we catch glimpses of a strong man who is victor as well as victim, who sets His face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem, who *chooses* to die for love of men. His destiny was His freedom and His freedom His destiny. We are, therefore, subdued to awe as we mark the kingly serenity with which His courage met the last storms. This is the Man born to be King.

Stand beside Him for a moment as He nears Jerusalem. This is an unforgettable moment for His disciples. While they cannot banish entirely from their minds their Master's dark words about

suffering and death, they sense obscurely that they are in the making of history. 'The hour overflows with supernatural power', writes Guardini. 'In these last days, it is as if Jesus were gathering strength on strength preparing for the ultimate.' One of the disciples—Peter perhaps—aware of the deep meaning of the procession which Jesus had carefully planned, cries out 'Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord'. The words are immediately taken up and thrown forward and backward in a swelling chorus among the disciples and pilgrims and interested bystanders.

But there are others present who cannot discern this humble kingliness of Jesus and regard His march either as pitiful play-acting or incitement to bloody rebellion or naked blasphemy. 'Rebuke your disciples, Master', said some of the Pharisees to Him, 'tell them to put an end to this dangerous farce at once'. The Church of Jesus Christ has heard that same plea again and again throughout her history. 'Nothing noisy or vulgar or outrageous, please! Let religion be discreet and reasonable and respectable! A little more sanity and a little less enthusiasm!' What this means in effect is that men want a religion of another kind than the Christian—a religion that keeps to the rut of established custom, that kindles no fires, that walks no razor's edge, that never gets to its feet to shout 'Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord'. This kind of religion is dangerous. In the end, it crucifies Christ.

How wonderfully our Lord answers this querulous and timorous objection! 'I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out'. In other words, 'If you can stop the singing of the birds, if you can hold back the dawn, if you can arrest the circling stars, then you may hope to dam back this flow of exultant praise. Shout they must. If their voices were silent, the very stones on this hillside would find a tongue with which to praise God for such an hour as this'. The entry of the King into His own city called for nothing less than an outburst of triumphant acclamation. When God made the world, runs a narrative in the dramatic poem Job, the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy. When God was about to remake His world through Christ, could the paeon of praise be absent from the lips of those who had seen God in Him? 'If these should hold their peace, the men who have lived with Me and prayed with Me and shared My concern and seen the power of heaven and known I came from God—But silent they cannot be'. No, Jesus, they cannot be silent. The heart that is flowing over cannot check the overflow. 'He hath put a new song in my mouth'. There is a soaring note of Christian gratitude that cannot be quenched.

Praise, my soul, the King of Heaven;  
To His feet thy tribute bring;  
Ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven,  
Who like thee His praise should sing?

George Macdonald wrote, 'Oh! The great fact of God shooting up into great heights of space, grand, indisputable reality! God and I, a creek into which ebbs and flows the infinite sea'. If ever we have met the inundation of God's astounding grace, then to hold our peace is surely to betray our great Christ.

Let us arrest the moving film and look again for a moment at this dramatic and fateful entry. Here is the King, in lowly fashion making His last bid for the heart of the city of His people, symbol of a world He seeks to gather to Himself and God. On the one side are those who proclaim Him King, however imperfectly they understand what He is about. On the other side rebuke and lowering silence. The Christian man can be in no doubt as to where he ought to stand. It is the business of the Church to proclaim Christ as King, the Head of Church and man and world. This is no verbal task. The Church and the Christian must go into the city of Mansoul in the spirit of self-giving service. If the world cannot be saved cheaply, it will not suffice simply to cry aloud the saving Name. We must be baptized into that Name in following in the way of the Cross. Palm Sunday must be linked forever with Good Friday and Easter Day.

Captain Beloved, battle wounds were thine  
Let me not wonder if some hurt be mine.  
Rather, O Lord, let my deep wonder be  
That I may share a battle wound with Thee.

O golden joy that Thou Lord givest them  
That follow Thee to far Jerusalem.  
O joy immortal when the trumpets sound  
And all the world is hushed to see Thee crowned.

#### EASTER DAY

#### The Risen Christ and Our Disappointments

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,  
CATHCART

'But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done'.—Lk 24<sup>21</sup>

To friends and only to friends did Jesus make known His conquest of the tomb. He came to them when they were alone, as to Mary in the Garden, or when they had gathered in small companies, as to the disciples in the Upper Room,

or when they had congregated in larger numbers, as when, according to Paul, five hundred had assembled and He made manifest His resurrection glory. When He revealed Himself as the victor over death He was not seeking to startle and stun men into an acceptance of His Messiahship. He was reviving and confirming the faith of His friends.

His appearances as the Risen Lord had, however, another significance. They did not merely give complete assurance to His friends that He had vanquished death and was alive forever more; they were meant to convince them that now as the Conqueror of the grave He was to His friends all that He had been in the days of His flesh. As, before His arrest, trial, and crucifixion, He met the needs and relieved the distresses of men and women, so now the same ministry He would continue. With this difference. Whereas in the days of His flesh His ministry was limited by time and space, now it would know no bounds.

No doubt a wide range of human experience was represented in the people to whom He appeared but in the instances recorded in the New Testament one state of human feeling preponderates. It is disappointment.

It was entirely typical of the Lord that He should come to these friends to meet their present need. This was His practice during His life in the flesh. He could never pass by anyone suffering from a disappointment which He could relieve. The cripple at the pool of Bethesda was enduring a disappointment of thirty-eight years' duration. Zacchaeus began to find the life which he lived utterly distasteful and frustrating and from a tree-top looked out for a cause of new hope. The rich young ruler, despite his most devoted obedience, could not lay hold upon the secret of contentment and peace. These and a multitude more were people aching with the uneasiness and pang of unsatisfied desire and unrealized hope to whom Jesus came with the offer of His grace, to set around them the horizons of a new world and to give for despair abiding fulfilment.

This was the ministry that the Risen Lord continued when He revealed His resurrection glory to His friends.

*On the Emmaus Road.* 'We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel'. These disciples were patriots who believed that the day of freedom was about to dawn. But He had failed them.

So the Risen Lord came to them. They had to see this experience that had cowed and unnerved them in a new setting. So He opened to them the Scriptures. They must see it in the light of the eternal purpose of God. As He revealed that purpose to them, tracing His way from the origins of their hopes in Moses, down through the

years until the inevitableness of the Cross became clear and convincing, something began to happen to them. They saw their disappointment in an entirely new perspective.

It is of the nature of secular hopes to end in disappointment.

How often has man shed his blood to strike down a tyranny only to find, after the brief hour of his triumph, that he is still unsatisfied. For a moment he has enjoyed the thrill of victory and breathed a cleaner air; and then the unsatisfied yearning has gnawed at his heart.

Why is man under this irresistible compulsion to rid himself of injustice and to seek a kingdom wherein dwelleth righteousness and yet his every effort ends in failure?

In a sense nothing is wrong with man. It is his nature to be like this. Man is too big, too dynamic, too complex for anything the world can offer. The measure of his disappointment and defeat is the evidence of his eternal origin and destiny. With the best that world can give there must come, inspiring, interpreting, sustaining, and enfolding it, that which will satisfy his immortal and spiritual cravings. The tasks to which he is called must have their beginning and end in an eternal kingdom.

To this need the Risen Christ speaks. He gives man something to live for in this world and at the same time does justice to the spiritual dimension in his nature. He presents a Kingdom to be won that has its manifestation in the lives and affairs of men but which has its origin in the eternal world. By His life in the flesh He makes known the nature of that Kingdom and the kind of people fit to enter it; by His resurrection He reveals how the Kingdom transcends the world of space and time with its limitations and frustrations. In the fellowship of His risen life, man becomes more poised, more harmonious, more strong, and, while man gives himself to the limited objectives of this restricted and inadequate world, he absorbs the life of an eternal world and is at peace with himself.

*By the Lakeside.* His disciples had toiled all night and had taken nothing. Again He met the need of disappointed men. 'Cast the net on the right side of the ship', He cried and immediately the net bulged with a catch.

This is a repetition of what He did in the days of His flesh. He came to men suffering the disappointments and frustrations of their daily occupation and He met their need.

For, while there are some people who are perfectly happy in their work, the vast majority are not. Indeed, at some point everybody is aware of the unease of unfulfilment in whatever we have chosen or been given as our vocation.

In some cases we can see quite easily the reason

for this. In an industrial society the tendency is more and more towards the depersonalizing of the operations whereby our economy is sustained. Persons lose their dignity and individual value. Therefore they labour under a sense of frustration.

With other people circumstances have made it impossible for them to be what they believed they were meant to become. The poverty of parents, domestic responsibilities, the meagreness of opportunity have so operated as to deprive many a person from realizing all that he had in him to be.

Whether it be as a result of these causes or for some other reason, all of us know the sense of failure that arises from the daily task to which we are committed.

And, when we are feeling like this, what is it that we most need? To be content with our lot? Well, sometimes this is the lesson we must learn. To rebel and break away from the cramping conditions of our work? For some people this is what they ought to do. But whatever it may be, one thing is essential. We must see ourselves in our true light. Who are we and what were we meant to be? If we see our lives in the light of the Risen Lord, life's frustrations and death transcended, we may endure or revolt as the power of Him enters into us, who are destined to be partners in His eternal Kingdom.

*In the Garden.* There she stands, a heart-broken woman, Mary, from whom her Lord had been taken away.

Remember who she was. If we are right in assuming that in the days of His flesh He had restored the character of this woman, sins forgiven and virtue renewed, then, if He were dead, what had she to live for? Without Him, would she relapse into her former life?

But the Risen Lord continued the work He began in the days of the flesh. Liberated from the limitations of time and space He would be more than ever for Mary the deliverer from guilt and shame and the strengthener of her piety.

Reduce it to its simplest elements and we see that Christian experience means fellowship with a Risen Lord. If this is not true, the gospel is a beautiful but tragic story that has no more purchase over the consciences and wills of men than the legends of Greece. The reality of the Christian faith is that He who died for us and our salvation, lives forever more as the invisible Companion of all who put their trust in Him. His word is powerful, His cross hallowing but His living presence redeeming.

To men and women, disappointed with themselves, biting the dust in remorse for their failures and sins, Jesus comes that, in the power of His resurrection, we may rise into newness of life.

'There are not just four gospels', says T. R. Glover, 'but ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands and all end with this, "Lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world".'

## Contributions and Comments

### Was our Lord an Only Child—Luke ii. 43-46?

SEVERAL letters have been received commenting on the short article printed in our issue of November, 1959, by the Rev. J. R. Gray on Lk 2<sup>43-46</sup>. In this he agreed that the failure of the parents of Jesus to be aware of His absence during the first stage of their journey from Jerusalem to Nazareth suggests that they had other younger children to absorb their attention.

The Rev. E. J. Payne takes a contrary view, and argues that had there been younger children Joseph would probably have returned to Jerusalem alone, while Mary stayed to care for the younger children.

The Rev. R. W. Thomas also points out that by Eastern custom the men and women would travel in separate companies, and it would be very easy for Mary and Joseph to assume that Jesus was travelling with the other. Moreover,

at the age of twelve a boy in the East is on the threshold of manhood, and would be left to care for himself more than a child of similar age in the West.

So both of them favour the view supported by Origen that the brothers and sisters of Jesus, mentioned in the Gospels, were older children of Joseph by a former marriage.—*Editor.*

### Ephesians iii. 13 and 2 Timothy ii. 10 in the light of Colossians i. 24

THE most satisfactory explanation of that *crux interpretum*, Col 1<sup>24</sup>, is the solution adopted for example by Best (*One Body in Christ*, 130 ff.). On this view, Paul sees his sufferings as part of the Messianic tribulations that precede the Final Day of Christ; these Messianic woes, which began with the crucifixion of the Messiah Himself, are

continued in His body, the Church. The full measure of these tribulations has to be completed before the return of Christ in glory, and Paul regards his present sufferings in prison as contributing to this end. His sufferings are 'for the sake of' the Colossians and the whole Church because they are bringing nearer the Day of Christ and the Day of Final Resurrection with Christ. If this is the correct interpretation of this difficult verse, then it may also throw light on two other passages in the Pauline Letters.

(1) Eph 3<sup>13</sup> διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἔκκακεῖν (or ἐγκακεῖν) ἐν ταῖς θλιψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν. This sentence forms the conclusion of a passage where Paul is discussing the privileged yet undeserved part he has been called to play in God's scheme of redemption. It is uncertain whether 'I' or 'you' is to be understood as the subject of the infinitive ἔκκακεῖν. The first alternative is probably to be preferred in view of the general context<sup>2</sup>; then Paul is praying that he may not disgrace his high calling as an Apostle by losing heart (or behaving badly) in his present afflictions. But, in any case, the position of ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν demands that it should be taken with ἐν ταῖς θλιψεσίν μου, which is also qualified by the relative clause ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν. Paul, therefore, sees his tribulations as being for the benefit and glory of the 'Ephesians'. In what sense is this true? There are two possibilities:

(a) Paul is referring to all the trials, which he has endured in his missionary work (2 Co 6<sup>4a</sup>, and 11<sup>23a</sup>.) and which have culminated in his imprisonment at Rome, and prays that he (or the 'Ephesians') may not lose heart at this apparently black picture of suffering, which has been incurred in the preaching of the gospel and so can be said to be 'on behalf of' the Gentile Christians addressed here. Paul's proclamation of the gospel has brought him tribulations, but it has brought the 'Ephesians' glory, either because they now have a new standing and honour in the sight of God (cf. 2 Co 4<sup>10a</sup>.) or because they have been given a hope of the glory of the Resurrection in the Final Day of Christ (δόξα is often associated in the Pauline Letters with the Advent of Christ and the resurrection of Christians: e.g., Ro 5<sup>2</sup> and 8<sup>18</sup>, 2 Co 4<sup>17</sup>, Ph 3<sup>21</sup>, Col 3<sup>4</sup>). The main difficulty about this explanation is that the passage seems to be referring to Paul's present sufferings and not to previous trials endured in

the preaching of the gospel. Paul has already described himself as 'the prisoner of the Lord' (3<sup>1</sup>), a reference to the imprisonment which he is now experiencing because of his service to Jesus Christ, and here he would most naturally be taken as referring back to that verse. It is Paul's present afflictions that are ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and are also δόξα ὑμῶν, and this is what requires explanation.

(b) Paul's present tribulations—purposeless as they appear to be—nevertheless possess some deep purpose in God's plan; somehow they are on behalf of the 'Ephesians' and bring the latter glory. In the light of Col 1<sup>24</sup>, the present passage makes sense. Paul's tribulations are part of the Messianic woes, and so in his patient endurance of them he is helping to bring nearer the time when Christ will be manifested, and the 'Ephesians' will be manifested with him in glory (cf. Col 3<sup>4</sup>). Paul's tribulations are the glory of the 'Ephesians' in the sense that they are shortening the time before the final glorification of Christians with Christ.<sup>3</sup>

(2) 2 Ti 2<sup>10</sup> διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας τύχωσιν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου. The passage forms part of a section of the letter where Paul is encouraging Timothy to a firm endurance in the cause of the Risen Christ, in whose service Paul is suffering hardship even to the point of imprisonment. Again Paul's sufferings are seen as serving a special purpose for 'the elect' (i.e. the members of the Christian Church, who are elected for final salvation). The passage means more than that Paul's courageous endurance will give the elect an example of perseverance, and will encourage them to a similar endurance and the attainment of final salvation. For the words make a direct connexion between Paul's endurance of his present sufferings and the attainment of salvation by the elect, and can most easily be explained in the light of Col 1<sup>24</sup>. Paul is encouraged to bear his hardships with fortitude, because he knows that they have a purpose in God's plan and are bringing nearer the final day of salvation.<sup>5</sup> Therefore he believes that despite

<sup>3</sup> Armitage Robinson (*op. cit.*, 80) and E. F. Scott (*op. cit.*, 101) both admit that Paul's sufferings are here seen as possessing 'a deep meaning' but do not use the background of Col 1<sup>24</sup> in order to arrive at a more exact interpretation.

<sup>4</sup> Whether or not the Pastorals are regarded as Post-Pauline does not affect the present issue.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, 47. '... sprach die alte Christenheit ... von dem Mass der Christus-leiden das vor dem Ende durchlitten werden müsse (Col 1<sup>24</sup>). Wenn Paulus etwas von diesem Leidensmass abträgt, so leidet er stellvertretend für die auserwählten; ...'

<sup>1</sup> The question of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians is not relevant here.

<sup>2</sup> So Dibelius, *An die Epheser*, 76; in contrast with Asmussen, *Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser*, 62; E. F. Scott, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, 101; Armitage Robinson, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, 173.

his imprisonment and imminent death 'the word of God is not bound' (2 Ti 2<sup>9</sup>).

G. H. P. THOMPSON

*The Theological College,  
Salisbury*

## Christ's True Glory<sup>1</sup>

It may be presumption but I have long felt that the usual translations and interpretations of Ph 2<sup>6</sup> are unsatisfactory, if not actually misleading. One has to be guided by the authorities, of course—but even authorities have been known to differ. What then? Are we to be democratic and decide that the majority must be right? That procedure need not be in the interests of truth. 'The many are not always right, the few not always wrong'. Truth must shine in its own light before it need be accepted and followed.

Knox's translation reads: 'His nature is, from the first, divine, and yet he did not see in the rank of Godhead a prize to be coveted; he dispossessed himself, and took the nature of a slave'.

J. B. Phillips' translation reads: 'For he, who had always been God by nature, did not cling to his prerogatives as God's Equal, but stripped himself of all privilege by consenting to be a slave by nature and being born as mortal man'.

Both of these follow the usual interpretation.

Years ago I learned that Greek words ending in *ós* signify a process—something being done. The word *ἀπαγγμός* does not mean 'something to be snatched' but 'a snatching'. This fact was confirmed in Dr. Barclay's exposition (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxx. [November 1958], 42), but it did not seem to me that the significant conclusion was drawn.

Paul believed in the eternal existence of the Son of God. Our Lord possessed equality with God, morally and spiritually. As Dr. Barclay said: 'Jesus Christ did not consider His own equality with God as an act of seizure and of plundering. There was no necessity that He should do so, for that equality was His and His by right.'

To my mind the essential point is this: Jesus Christ being of the essence of God knew that the Divine nature does not consist of grasping, of taking for oneself, so He let go, He 'emptied Himself'.

The Messiah the nation expected was one who would claim certain things as His by right. Psalm

<sup>1</sup>Major Dean (S.A.) has worked out the idea in this Note more fully, applying it to the whole life of Jesus, in *Power and Glory* which is published by the Salvationist Publishing and Supplies Ltd., at 3s. 6d. net.

72 provides us with a picture of a king who 'shall break in pieces the oppressor', who 'shall have dominion also from sea to sea', and whose 'enemies shall lick the dust'. But being like God, Jesus did not snatch, or assert Himself, but did the very opposite, and *the more He emptied Himself, the more He revealed what God was like*.

Born an outcast—with more than a suggestion of illegitimacy—working with His hands in a carpenter's shop, identifying Himself with sinners in baptism, befriending the harlots and tax-gatherers, dying upon the Cross between two felons—the lower His prestige, the more glorious became the revelation. The more He denied worldly values, the clearer men saw the values of God's Kingdom. When He became 'as nothing' the unveiling of God was complete.

The usual translations and interpretations seem to suggest that in dispossessing Himself, 'consenting to be a slave', He was making Himself in some way less than God. But it was in this He was being Godlike—the Incarnation was not an act.

Sometimes we speak of the 'condescension' of our Lord in coming to earth as a Babe, living as a peasant, and dying as a criminal. But the amazing fact is that in doing so *He was revealing the truth about God*. Had He come in any other way, lived any other sort of life, and died any other kind of death, that would have been a guise, a mere pretence. The truth is that our God is a humble God. There was no element of pretence in the Incarnation, which is one reason why it was an offence. Many who were quite sincerely looking for God's Messiah failed to recognize Jesus as the fulfilment of the prophetic word.

Men demand a God who recognizes the dignity of His position, but 'Lo, He abhors not the Virgin's womb'. Men want a God who can throw His weight about, but 'he became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross'. Men cannot understand a God who possesses physical power yet refuses to use it. God *does* possess physical power. His word 'built the skies', and His voice 'rolls the stars along'. Yet when it comes to laying claim to the human heart, He makes no use of those attributes we normally associate with almightiness.

Here we see the need for radical re-thinking. The power to dominate matter is not the power that matters. The final truth about God is not omnipotence, but Love. So we betray the worldliness of our standards when we borrow the baubles that surround earthly kings and think of God in terms of crowns and thrones.

When the prophet Isaiah saw the Lord 'high and lifted up', he became aware of one aspect of His nature, but not the most important. In

order fully to understand God we need to dissociate His attributes from His character, the things He can do from the kind of God He is.

They all were looking for a king  
To slay their foes, and lift them high :  
Thou can'st a little baby thing  
That made a woman cry.

There may be others, but I have found only one translation expressing the idea that to me possesses such spiritual value. This is the 1949 edition in Basic English, which reads: 'To whom being in the form of God, it did not seem that to take

for oneself was to be like God, but He made Himself as nothing, taking the form of a servant'.

It is difficult for us always to remember that Paul did not think in Nicene terms. In Ph 2 he was not speculating on the relation between God the Father and God the Son, but glorying in the sublime revelation afforded by the Incarnation.

A question, then, for translators: Is this Basic English rendering legitimate?

A question, too, for theologians: Is the above interpretation permissible?

HARRY DEAN

London

## Recent Foreign Theology

**The Nag Hammadi Finds.** Much has already been written on the Coptic Gnostic texts found at Nag Hammadi, and Professor W. C. van Unnik is known to English readers in this connexion by his joint-authorship of a book on *The Jung Codex* which has been translated into English. He has now written a small Dutch book giving a general account of the finds, under the title *Revelation from the Sands of Egypt*.<sup>1</sup> After telling the story of the discovery Professor van Unnik writes on the character of the contents of the find, many of the texts of which have not yet been published, and then turns to discuss the background of Gnosticism and its encounter with Christianity before treating in separate chapters of the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Truth, the Apocryphon of John and the Apocryphon of James. As more of the texts become available interest in this astonishing library, which rivals the Dead Sea Scrolls in importance, if not in the number of publications it has so far produced or in the popular excitement it has caused, is likely to grow. Dr. Walter Till has recently published some new sayings of Jesus found in the Gospel of Thomas,<sup>2</sup> which add to the information given by Professor van Unnik on this text which has so lately been published. For a brief general account of the finds so far as they are yet known, this little book is admirable.

**The Jerusalem Bible.** Some further volumes of the revised edition of the Jerusalem Bible have now appeared. These include three Old Testament volumes (Numbers, Joshua, and Judith-Esther) and three New Testament volumes (Acts, Galatians-Romans, Corinthians).<sup>3</sup> Again the amount of

<sup>1</sup> *Openbaringen uit Egyptisch Zand (Exegetica, II. v.)* [1958]. Van Keulen, The Hague; Fl. 5.25.

<sup>2</sup> *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xli. [1959], 446-458.

<sup>3</sup> Published by Les Editions du Cerf, Paris. [1958 or 1959].

the revision varies considerably, and in the case of Joshua the new edition is more than twenty pages longer than the old. From this it will be seen that the revision is not casual and perfunctory, but that a serious effort has been made to improve the volumes, so that the new edition is not superfluous for those who have the old. The comments are brief and judicious, while the translation has had a remarkable reception amongst French speaking readers. Father de Vaux and his colleagues in the Dominican School in Jerusalem, who have sponsored this work, are to be congratulated on the success it has achieved.

**Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions.** A little French work by Professor Henri Michaud, in the series edited by André Parrot, is devoted to inscriptions on stone, ostraca and seals which have come down to us from ancient Palestine.<sup>4</sup> After a brief account of the earliest forms of writing which have survived in Palestine, the author deals with the Gezer Calendar, and then with the Moabite Stone—here going beyond the strict letter of his sub-title—the inscriptions of Tell Qasileh and Hazor, the ostraca from Samaria, the Siloam inscription, the Lachish letters, seal inscriptions, and jar handles. Facsimiles and translations of the texts are given, together with notes on them and on their significance for the Bible student. In dealing with the Lachish letters Professor Michaud discusses the question whether 'the prophet' mentioned in them is Jeremiah, and concludes that though some things would well fit Jeremiah the identification is improbable. He does not mention Professor Winton Thomas's published lecture on this question, or his other

<sup>4</sup> *Sur la Pierre at l'Argile: Inscriptions hébraïques et Ancien Testament (Cahiers d'archéologie biblique, No. 10)* [1958]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel and Paris.

writings on the Lachish letters, save two which are noted in the bibliography, to neither of which has he had access. The work is excellently illustrated, and chimes well with the current interest in archaeological finds which illustrate the Bible.

**Israel and the Gentiles.** Professor Martin-Achard has written a little book on the missionary perspective of the Old Testament, under the title *Israel and the Nations*,<sup>1</sup> in which some original views are expressed. He finds in the Old Testament no thought of Israel's mission to the Gentiles, but only the thought that Israel's service to the world is just to be loyal to her own faith. In Deutero-Isaiah he holds the monotheistic and universalistic elements to be secondary, and the consolation of Israel to be essential. The mission of the Servant is not to carry to the Gentiles the true faith, but to make manifest the judgment which God has pronounced in favour of Israel. It is perhaps significant that for this purpose Professor Martin-Achard limits himself to the first two of the Servant Songs. A number of other passages are examined, Gn 12<sup>3</sup>, Ex 19<sup>6</sup>, Mal 1<sup>11</sup>, Is 19<sup>21f</sup>, Jon 4<sup>11</sup>, Ps 117<sup>1</sup>, Is 2<sup>2a</sup>, and everywhere the author finds fundamentally the same thought, that Israel serves the world by her own loyalty, and is called to be prophet, priest and king to the nations. He notes that Jonah is not sent to convert Nineveh to Judaism but to turn her to repentance by the warning of judgment.

On all this more is to be said than can be said here. The story of Jonah is of one who was sent by Yahweh to be His messenger to Nineveh, and unless the author rejected the thought of Deutero-Isaiah, 'Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth,' it would be remarkable for him to think of Jonah being content to turn men to repentance but not to God. Moreover, while there are many currents in the thought of Deutero-Isaiah, the missionary thought is not to be eliminated. In the passage just cited he says: 'Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth. For I am God, and there is no other . . . To me every knee shall bow.' Here there is the clear thought that because God alone is God, He is to be worshipped by all men, and that He desires the whole world to look to Him, and not alone to Israel's faithfulness. And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? Without Jonah Nineveh could not have received

the word of God. And how can it be thought that to Nineveh alone outside Israel did God purpose to send a messenger?

The author ends his study by observing that it has a relevance to the Church to-day, which should remember that the evangelization of the world is not a matter of word or action, but only of the presence of God amongst His own people. This would seem to bring our Lord under condemnation for preaching the good news, instead of being content to enjoy the fellowship of God for Himself.

**The Qumran Sect.** Professor Bardtke, who had already published a book on the Dead Sea Scrolls dealing with the finds of Cave I, has now published a sequel, with the sub-title *The Sect of Qumran*,<sup>2</sup> giving an account of the excavations at Qumran and of the finds in the other caves, so far as they are yet known. The second part of the book gives translations of texts, while the first—and larger—part discusses many of the issues they raise, in addition to the descriptive accounts mentioned. There is an interesting chapter on Qumran in the history of Palestinian exploration, which contains not a little information not readily accessible elsewhere. The establishment of the Qumran centre is commonly ascribed to a date in the last third of the second century B.C., but Bardtke places it rather earlier than this. He identifies the 'Lion of Wrath' of the Nahum Commentary with Antiochus Epiphanes, and also conjectures that the Hymns Scroll is the Book of Hagu or Hagi mentioned in the Zadokite Work, since he regards the hymns as exercises in meditation. The death of the Teacher of Righteousness he places c. 130 B.C. Many original suggestions will be found in this book, which should not be neglected by any who would keep up-to-date in the heavily cultivated field of Scrolls research. In a chapter on the Qumran sect and Christianity, he cautions against many of the extravagant claims that have been made, often on the basis of pure conjecture, and warns his readers against the 'pan-Qumranism' which seems to be developing in some quarters. This does not mean, of course, that the Scrolls are held to be of no significance for New Testament study, but that they should be used with discrimination.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester

<sup>1</sup> *Israel et les Nations* (Cahiers Théologiques, No. 42) [1959]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel and Paris; Swiss Fr. 4.50.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumran* [1958]. Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, Berlin; DM. 12.80.

## Entre Nous

### A Prince of the Church

In *Cyril Forster Garbett, Archbishop of York* (Hodder and Stoughton; 35s. net) Canon Charles Smyth uses as one of his chapter heading quotations Bishop Ken's picture of the perfect priest:

Of an Ambassador the just address,  
A Father's Tenderness, a Shepherd's Care,  
A Leader's Courage, which the Cross can bear,  
A Ruler's Awe, a Watchman's wakeful Eye,  
A Pilot's skill, the Helm in Storms to ply,  
A Fisher's patience, and a Lab'rer's Toil,  
A Guide's Dexterity to disembroil,  
A Prophet's Inspiration from Above,  
A Teacher's Knowledge, and a *Saviour's* Love.

That is the pattern against which a priest's ministry must be judged.

Judged by any standards, Cyril Forster Garbett had a great and a full life. An honours degree in history and President of the Union in Oxford, first curate and then vicar at Portsea, Bishop of Southwark, Bishop of Winchester, Archbishop of York—it is a *cursus honorum* which makes a notable record. What manner of man was this?

Beyond a doubt he was a hard man. Henry Vodden, who was Garbett's Suffragan at Hull, writes of him: 'He was less likely to praise in his comments on people or situations than to draw attention to their faults. He could be very ruthless of the feelings of others. His staff (the Suffragan Bishops and Archdeacons) did not find him easy to work with. He had a very high standard of duty, and sometimes expected his staff to do more than could be reasonably expected.' Garbett's trouble was that he set—and maintained—a standard of duty for himself which was practically impossible for any one else. Some one said of him that his preparation for paradise—or, it might be, his own particular purgatory—might well be 'his divesting himself of his chronic time-sense, and his incessant work, preparation for work, and then more work!' Even Garbett's holidays had to have their time-table.

Once an unfortunate curate arrived three minutes late for a licencing, and he was sent away and told to wait for the next licencing which would be in two or three months' time. Any one ten minutes late for an appointment was liable to be sent away, and the sending away was a task which at least one of his chaplains hated. If a local parson was selected as his chaplain for some function, and helped him to robe, Garbett would say: 'I asked for a chaplain, not a valet'.

It was not that Garbett did not know himself.

On his eightieth birthday all kinds of tributes were paid to him. Yet he wrote in his private diary: 'People have been undeservedly kind, they have formed an ideal picture of myself—the devoted pastor, the kindly old gentleman, and the courageous prophet! They don't see me as I really am, selfish, self-centred, seeking and enjoying the praise of men, lazy, possessive, and timid.' No man ever knew himself better than Garbett did.

One of his curious gifts was his ability to get on with the press. This was very far from being the result of any desire for personal publicity; it was entirely in the interests of the Church. Once before a service a reporter came to him to ask what subject he intended to preach on, with note-book open and pencil poised. Garbett said he was to preach on 'The Love of God'. The note-book was closed; the pencil put away; and the reporter left murmuring that he had hoped that Garbett was to preach on something important!

Once the General of the Salvation Army and his wife stayed the night at Bishopthorpe—and arrived an hour and a half late for dinner! Garbett said afterwards with perfect seriousness: 'I felt as some of the early Christians must have felt when they were entertaining Apostles'.

Garbett never married; he was essentially a very lonely man; and once at least the corner of the veil is lifted. Garbett especially in his later years had a wonderful way with children who loved him. His chaplain, Gordon Hooper, had a little son, John Hooper, who was never well. The little lad died—and to the very end of his life Garbett kept in his desk—not tucked away, but right in the front of the top drawer—a small rubber ball which had belonged to John Hooper as a little boy. Maybe Garbett was hard just because he was lonely.

This is a really great biography. It paints Garbett as Cromwell wished to be painted—'Warts and all'. Sometimes the reader almost hates Garbett, at all times he respects and admires him, and just sometimes he loves him, for in Garbett there was much of the prince of the Church—and somewhere in the depths of him something of the saint.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

---

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.